

KOLMOGOROV EQUATIONS AND WEAK ORDER ANALYSIS FOR SPDES WITH NONLINEAR DIFFUSION COEFFICIENT

CHARLES-EDOUARD BRÉHIER AND ARNAUD DEBUSSCHE

ABSTRACT. We provide new regularity results for the solutions of the Kolmogorov equation associated to a SPDE with nonlinear diffusion coefficients and a Burgers type nonlinearity. This generalizes previous results in the simpler cases of additive or affine noise. The basic tool is a discrete version of a two sided stochastic integral which allows a new formulation for the derivatives of these solutions. We show that this can be used to generalize the weak order analysis performed in [16]. The tools we develop are very general and can be used to study many other examples of applications.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Kolmogorov equation associated to a stochastic equation is a fundamental object. It is important to have a good understanding of this equation since many properties of the stochastic equation can be derived. For instance, it may be used to obtain uniqueness results - in the weak or strong sense - using ideas initially developed by Stroock and Varadhan [41] or the so-called "Itô Tanaka" trick widely used by F. Flandoli and co-authors, see for instance [19]. Also, it is the basic tool in the weak order analysis of stochastic equations, see [42].

For Stochastic Partial Differential Equations (SPDEs), the associated Kolmogorov equation is not a standard object since it is a partial differential equations for an unknown depending on time and on an infinite dimensional variable. In the case of an additive noise, it has been the object of several studies, see [8], [15], [11], [30], [40] and the references therein. But for general diffusion coefficients, very little is known. In [12], strict solutions are constructed but the assumptions are extremely strong and the result is of little interest in the applications.

In this work, we consider a parabolic semilinear Stochastic Partial Differential Equation (SPDE) of the following form:

$$(1) \quad dX_t = AX_t dt + G(X_t)dt + \sigma(X_t)dW_t,$$

where W is a cylindrical Wiener process on a separable infinite dimensional Hilbert space H . Typically, H is the space of square integrable functions on an open, bounded, interval in \mathbb{R} so that the SPDE is driven by a space time white noise.

We wish to study regularity properties of the solutions of the associated Kolmogorov equation. The main application we have in mind is the weak order analysis of a Euler scheme applied to (1). This has been the subject of many articles in the last decade, see [4], [5], [6], [16], [17], [20], [23], [28], [29], [43], [47], [48]. In all these articles, the method is a generalization of the finite dimensional proof initially used in [42] (see also the monographs [27] and [32] for further references) and based on the Kolmogorov equation associated to (1). These results are restricted to the case of a σ satisfying very strong assumptions.

Thus our first aim is to obtain new regularity estimates on the transition semigroup $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$. When (1) has a unique solution (which is the case in the present article), denoted by $(X(t, x))_{t \geq 0}$, it is defined by

$$(2) \quad u(t, x) = P_t \varphi(x) = \mathbb{E}(\varphi(X(t, x))),$$

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60H15;35R15;60H35.

Key words and phrases. Stochastic Partial Differential Equations, Kolmogorov equations in infinite dimensions, two-sided stochastic integrals, Malliavin calculus, weak convergence rates.

This work was started during the Fall semester 2015, while A. Debussche was in residence at the Mathematical Sciences Research Institute in Berkeley, California, supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DMS-1440140. A. Debussche benefits from the support of the French government "Investissements d'Avenir" program ANR-11-LABX- 0020-01.

where φ is a bounded borelian function on H . The function u formally satisfies the Kolmogorov equation:

$$(3) \quad \frac{du}{dt}(t, x) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\sigma(x)\sigma^*(x)D^2u(t, x)) + \langle Ax + G(x), Du(t, x) \rangle, \quad u(0, x) = \varphi(x).$$

As usual, we have identified the first order derivative of u with respect to x and its gradient in H and the second order derivative with the Hessian. The inner product in H is denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$.

Our arguments are general and can be applied in various situations. However, in order to concentrate on the new arguments, we consider a prototype example. Namely, we take three functions $\tilde{F}_1, \tilde{F}_2, \sigma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and consider the following stochastic partial differential equation on the interval $(0, 1)$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions and driven by a space time white noise:

$$\begin{cases} dX = (\partial_{\xi\xi}X + \tilde{F}_1(X) + \partial_{\xi}\tilde{F}_2(X))dt + \tilde{\sigma}(X)dW, & t > 0, x \in (0, 1), \\ X(0, t) = X(1, t) = 0, \\ X(\xi, 0) = x(\xi). \end{cases}$$

The initial data x is given in $L^2(0, 1)$ and W is a cylindrical Wiener process (see [14]). This equation can be rewritten in the abstract form (1) classically. Indeed, we define $H = L^2(0, 1)$ with norm $|\cdot|$, $A = \partial_{\xi\xi}$ on the domain $D(A) = H^2(0, 1) \cap H_0^1(0, 1)$, and the Nemytskii operators:

$$F_i(x) = \tilde{F}_i(x(\cdot)), \quad \sigma(x)h = \tilde{\sigma}(x(\cdot))h(\cdot), \quad x \in H, \quad h \in H.$$

Assuming that \tilde{F}_1, \tilde{F}_2 , and $\tilde{\sigma}$ are bounded, this defines $F_1, F_2 : H \rightarrow H$ and $\sigma : H \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(H)$, where $\mathcal{L}(H)$ is the space of bounded linear operators on H . Below, we assume that \tilde{F}_1, \tilde{F}_2 and $\tilde{\sigma}$ are functions of class C^3 , which are bounded and have bounded derivatives. However, it is well-known that F_1, F_2 and σ do not inherit these regularity properties on H . The control of their derivatives requires the use of L^p norms.

Finally, setting $B = \partial_{\xi}$ on $H^1(0, 1)$ and $G = F_1 + BF_2$, we obtain an equation in the abstract form (1) above.

Global existence and uniqueness of a solution $X \in L^2(\Omega; C([0, T]; H))$ follow from standard arguments (see [14] for instance). Indeed, we have boundedness and Lipschitz continuity properties on the coefficients G and σ . Thus the transition semigroup can be defined by the formula (2).

The regularity results which are required for the numerical analysis and which we obtain in this article have roughly the following form, under appropriate assumptions on φ : for $t \in (0, T)$

$$(4) \quad \begin{aligned} |Du(t, x) \cdot h| &\leq C(T, \varphi)t^{-\alpha}|(-A)^{-\alpha}h|, \\ |D^2u(t, x) \cdot (h, k)| &\leq C(T, \varphi)t^{-(\beta+\gamma)}|(-A)^{-\beta}h||(-A)^{-\gamma}k|, \end{aligned}$$

where $(-A)^{-\alpha}$ denotes a negative power (for $\alpha > 0$) of the linear operator $-A$. We do not make precise which L^p norms appear on the right-hand side in (4). Precise and rigorous statements are given in Section 3.1.

Note that these regularity results are natural. They hold for instance in the case $G = 0, \sigma = 0$ for any $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \geq 0$ thanks to the regularization properties of the heat semi-group. Using elementary arguments (differentiation inside the expectation, control of the derivative processes using Itô's formula and Gronwall inequalities), see for instance [2], [16], one can consider the case when the diffusion coefficient σ is constant - additive noise case. Then the estimate above holds for $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, and $\beta, \gamma \in [0, 1)$ such that $\beta + \gamma < 1$. The case of an affine σ is also treated in the above references but then we impose $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$. When the diffusion coefficient σ is nonlinear (the so-called multiplicative noise case), the results obtained so far in the literature are not satisfactory: the extra restriction $\beta + \gamma < \frac{1}{2}$ is imposed. This is not sufficient for the applications. For the weak order analysis, we need to take $\beta + \gamma$ arbitrarily close to 1.

Also, the right hand side of (3) is well defined only if one is able to get (4) for $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, $\beta, \gamma \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$ with $\beta + \gamma > \frac{1}{2}$. This is important to prove existence of strict solutions to this Kolmogorov equation and thus to generalize results available in the case of additive noise.

In this article, we introduce a new approach to obtain such results. Our first main contribution in this article is to prove that in (4) one may take $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and $\beta, \gamma \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$, in the multiplicative noise case, for SPDEs of the type of (1).

Our strategy is based on new expressions for the first and the second order derivatives of u . They are obtained thanks to Malliavin integration by parts, and are written in terms of some two-sided stochastic

integrals, with anticipating integrands. Such integrals can be defined in many different ways: see for instance [1], [31], [35] where the definition of such integrals is motivated by similar reasons to ours. The two-sided integrals which are required in this work are similar to those developed in [34], [37], [36], except that we need to consider more general types of integrands.

We have not found the construction of the two-sided integrals required in our work in the literature. Although interesting in itself, their rigorous and general construction would considerably lengthen the article; this is left for future works. Instead, we have chosen a different approach: we have chosen to consider time discretized versions of the problem, and to pass to the limit in estimates. Indeed, at the discrete time level the construction of the two-sided integrals is straightforward. Nonetheless, we give a formal derivation of the formulas in Section 4.1 to explain our ideas and the type of integrals which would be required to have a direct proof in continuous time.

Once new regularity estimates on the solutions of Kolmogorov equations are obtained, our second contribution is to address the weak order analysis of the following Euler scheme applied to (1):

$$X_{n+1} - X_n = \Delta t (AX_{n+1} + G(X_n))dt + \sigma(X_n)(W((n+1)\Delta t) - W(n\Delta t)), \quad X_0 = x,$$

where Δt is the time step. We prove that the weak rate of convergence is equal to $\frac{1}{2}$: for arbitrarily small $\kappa \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$,

$$|\mathbb{E}\varphi(X(N\Delta t)) - \varphi(X_N)| \leq C_\kappa(T, \varphi, x)\Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa},$$

where the integer N is such that $N\Delta t = T$, for arbitrary but fixed $T \in (0, \infty)$.

The value $\frac{1}{2}$ for the weak order convergence is natural: indeed, it is possible to show that (for an appropriate norm $\|\cdot\|$) one has the strong convergence rate $\frac{1}{4}$: $\mathbb{E}\|X(N\Delta t) - X_N\| \leq C_\kappa(T, x)\Delta t^{\frac{1}{4}-\frac{\kappa}{2}}$.

Like in [5], [6], in the case of ergodic SPDEs, the analysis can be extended on arbitrarily large time intervals, with a uniform control of the error. This yields error estimates concerning the approximation of invariant distributions. In fact, under appropriate conditions on the Lipschitz constants of the nonlinear coefficients, one can include factors of the type $\exp(-ct)$, with $c > 0$, on the right-hand sides of the equations in (4); alternatively, these regularity estimates are transferred to the solutions of associated Poisson equations. We do not consider this question further in this article.

We generalize the proof of [16], and of subsequent articles, which was done under the artificial assumptions that $F : H \rightarrow H$ and $\sigma : H \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(H)$ are of class C^2 , with bounded derivatives, and that the second order derivative of σ satisfies a very restrictive assumption. As already explained above, the new regularity estimates on the solutions of Kolmogorov equation obtained in the first part of the article are fundamental. Here we treat diffusion coefficients of Nemytskii type, and drift coefficients which are sums of Nemytskii and Burgers type nonlinearities. Treating Burgers type nonlinearities is one of the novelties, and one of the main source of technical difficulties, of this work. Even if the decomposition of the error and ideas in the control of the terms are similar to [16], we need to consider all the terms again since the functional setting is different.

Another approach, using the concept of mild Itô processes, see [10], [13], has been recently studied to provide weak convergence rates for SPDEs (1) with multiplicative noise, for several examples of numerical schemes: see [9], [24], [25], [26]. In particular, in [24], a similar result as ours is obtained when the Burgers type nonlinearity is absent ($F_2 = 0$). This requires also to work in a Banach spaces setting, with an appropriate type of mild Itô formula [10]. It is not clear that this can be extended to the case $F_2 \neq 0$. Moreover, we believe that our way of treating the discretization error is more natural and somewhat simpler. We also mention that the regularity requirements are weaker in our work.

Also, in [3], a completely different approach is used; but up to now, this covers only additive noise, *i.e.* the case when σ is constant.

In future works, we plan to analyze the weak error associated to spatial discretization, using Finite Elements, like in [4]. Note that the analysis of the weak error may also be generalized to other examples of time discretization schemes, such as exponential Euler schemes, like in [43], [47] for instance.

We have chosen to consider SPDEs (1) of one type, namely with Nemytskii diffusion coefficients, and Nemytskii and Burgers type nonlinear drift coefficients, driven by space-time white noise, in dimension 1. We believe that natural generalizations hold true, for instance for equations in dimension 2 or 3, with appropriate noise. Moreover, considering coefficients with unbounded derivatives, with polynomial growth

assumptions, is also an important subject, which we have not chosen to treat; indeed it would have required to deal with additional technical difficulties, resulting in hiding the fundamental ideas of our approach.

On a more theoretical point of view, we leave for future work the important question of the construction in continuous time of the two-side stochastic integrals used in the proof of the new regularity results for the solutions of Kolmogorov equations. It may also be interesting to generalize these estimates to higher order derivatives. Finally, we believe that these results and the strategy of proof will have other applications, beyond analysis of weak convergence rates.

This article is organized as follows. The functional setting is made precise in Section 2. Section 3 contains the statements of our main results, on the regularity of the solution of the Kolmogorov equation (Section 3.1), then on the weak rate of convergence of the Euler approximation (Section 3.2). Detailed proofs are given in Section 4 and in Section 5 respectively.

2. SETTING

We use the notation $\mathbb{N}^* = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ for the set of (positive) integers.

Throughout the article, c or C denote generic positive constants, which may change from line to line. We do not always precise the various parameters they depend on. When necessary, we write $C = C_{\dots}(\dots)$ to emphasize the dependence on some parameters, by convention it is locally bounded on the domains where the parameters live.

2.1. Functional spaces and stochastic integration. In all the article, given two Banach spaces E_1 and E_2 , $C_b^k(E_1; E_2)$, or $C_b^k(E_1)$ when $E_1 = E_2$, is the space of bounded C^k functions from E_1 to E_2 with bounded derivatives up to order k . Also $\mathcal{L}(E_1; E_2)$ denotes the space of bounded linear operators from E_1 to E_2 . If $E_1 = E_2$, we set $\mathcal{L}(E_1) = \mathcal{L}(E_1; E_1)$.

The SPDE (1) is considered as taking values in the separable Hilbert space $H = L^2(0, 1)$, with norm (resp. inner product) denoted by $|\cdot|$ (resp. $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$). We will also extensively use the Banach spaces $L^p(0, 1)$, for $p \in [1, \infty]$; the L^p norm is denoted by $|\cdot|_{L^p}$.

When K is a separable Hilbert space, the trace operator is denoted by $\text{Tr}(\cdot)$; recall that $\text{Tr}\Psi$ is well defined when $\Psi \in \mathcal{L}(K)$ is nuclear ([21]).

We recall that if $\Psi \in \mathcal{L}(K)$ is a nuclear operator and $L \in \mathcal{L}(K)$ is a bounded linear mapping, then $L\Psi$ and ΨL are nuclear operators, and $\text{Tr}L\Psi = \text{Tr}\Psi L$.

Let H_1, H_2 be two separable Hilbert spaces. For $L \in \mathcal{L}(H_1, H_2)$, we denote by L^* its adjoint. We now introduce the space $\mathcal{L}_2(H_1; H_2)$ of Hilbert-Schmidt operators from H_1 to H_2 : a linear mapping $\Phi \in \mathcal{L}(H_1; H_2)$ is an Hilbert-Schmidt operator if $\Phi^*\Phi \in \mathcal{L}(H_1, H_1)$ is nuclear, and the associated norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H_1, H_2)}$ satisfies $\|\Phi\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H_1; H_2)} = \|\Phi^*\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H_2; H_1)} = (\text{Tr} \Phi \Phi^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. We use the notation $\mathcal{L}_2(H_1) = \mathcal{L}_2(H_1; H_1)$.

For a function $\psi \in C^1(H; \mathbb{R})$, we often identify the first order derivative and the gradient: $\langle D\psi(x), h \rangle = D\psi(x) \cdot h$, for $x, h \in H$. Similarly, if $\psi \in C^2(H; \mathbb{R})$, we often identify the second order derivative and the Hessian: $\langle D^2\psi(x)h, k \rangle = D^2\psi(x) \cdot (h, k)$, for $x, h, k \in H$.

We are now in position to present basic elements about stochastic Itô integrals on Hilbert spaces, see [14] for further properties. The cylindrical Wiener process on H is defined by

$$(5) \quad W(t) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*} \beta_i(t) f_i,$$

where $(\beta_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ is a sequence of independent standard scalar Wiener processes on a filtered probability space satisfying the usual conditions $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$ and $(f_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ is a complete orthonormal system of H .

It is standard that this representation does not depend on the choice of the complete orthonormal system of H . Moreover, it is well-known that $W(t)$ as defined by (5) does not take values in H ; however, the series is convergent in any larger Hilbert space K , such that the embedding from H into K is an Hilbert-Schmidt operator.

Given a predictable process $\Phi \in L^2(\Omega \times (0, T); \mathcal{L}_2(H; K))$, the integral $\int_0^T \Phi(s) dW(s)$ is a well defined Itô integral with values in the Hilbert space K . Moreover, Itô's isometry reads:

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\left\| \int_0^T \Phi(s) dW(s) \right\|_K^2 \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T \|\Phi(s)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H; K)}^2 ds \right).$$

In the sequel, we will need to control L^p norms of stochastic integrals, for $p \in [2, \infty)$, for processes Φ with values in $\mathcal{L}(H; E)$, where $E = L^p(0, 1)$ is a separable Banach space. The space $\mathcal{L}_2(H, K)$ of Hilbert-Schmidt operators is then replaced by the space $R(H, E)$ of γ -radonifying operator: a linear operator $\Psi \in \mathcal{L}(H, E)$ is a γ -radonifying operator, if the image by Φ of the canonical gaussian distribution on H extends to a Borel probability measure on E . The space $R(H; E)$ is equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{R(H; E)}$ defined by

$$\|\Phi\|_{R(H; E)}^2 = \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left| \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*} \gamma_i \Phi f_i \right|^2,$$

where $(\gamma_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ is a sequence of independent standard (mean 0 and variance 1) Gaussian random variables, defined on a probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$, with expectation operator denoted by $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}$, and $(f_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ is a complete orthonormal system. The expression of $\|\Phi\|_{R(H; E)}$ does not depend on the choice of these elements. We refer for instance to [7, 45, 46] for further properties.

An important tool which is used frequently in the sequel is the left and right ideal property for γ -radonifying operators: for every separable Hilbert spaces K, \mathcal{K} and for every Banach spaces $E = L^p(0, 1)$, $\mathcal{E} = L^q(0, 1)$, with $p, q \in [2, \infty)$, for every $L_1 \in \mathcal{L}(E, \mathcal{E})$, $\Psi \in R(K, E)$ and $L_2 \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K}, K)$, one has $L_1 \Psi L_2 \in R(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E})$,

$$(6) \quad \|L_1 \Psi L_2\|_{R(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E})} \leq \|L_1\|_{\mathcal{L}(E, \mathcal{E})} \|\Psi\|_{R(K, E)} \|L_2\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K}, K)}.$$

For $E = L^p(0, 1)$ with $p \in [2, \infty)$, the following generalization of Itô's isometry holds true, in terms of an inequality only: for predictable processes $\Phi \in L^2(\Omega \times (0, T); R(H; E))$, the Itô integral $\int_0^T \Phi(s) dW(s)$ can be defined, with values in E , and there exists $c_E \in (0, \infty)$, depending only on the space E , such that

$$(7) \quad \mathbb{E} \left(\left\| \int_0^T \Phi(s) dW(s) \right\|_E^2 \right) \leq c_E \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T \|\Phi(s)\|_{R(H, E)}^2 ds \right).$$

Finally, generalizations of Burkholder-Davies-Gundy inequalities are also available and will be used throughout the article.

To simplify the notation, we often write L^p instead of $L^p(0, 1)$.

2.2. Coefficients of the SPDE. In this section, we give definitions and properties of the coefficients A , $G = F_1 + BF_2$, and σ , which appear in (1).

The operator A is an unbounded linear operator on $H = L^2(0, 1)$: it is defined as the Laplace operator on $(0, 1)$, with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions, on the domain $D(A) = H^2(0, 1) \cap H_0^1(0, 1)$. It satisfies Property 2.1 below.

Property 2.1. For $i \in \mathbb{N}^*$, define $e_i = \sqrt{2} \sin(i\pi \cdot)$ and $\lambda_i = (i\pi)^2$. Then

- $(e_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ is a complete orthonormal system of H , and, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}^*$,

$$Ae_i = -\lambda_i e_i.$$
- For any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i^{-\alpha} < \infty$ if and only if $\alpha > \frac{1}{2}$.
- the family of eigenvectors is equibounded in L^∞ : $\sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*} \|e_i\|_{L^\infty} < \infty$.

In particular, for every $p \in [2, \infty]$, $\sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*} \|e_i\|_{L^p} < \infty$. This equiboundedness property is crucial for many estimates which will be proved in this article.

For every $p \in (2, \infty)$, A can also be seen as an unbounded linear operator on $L^p(0, 1)$, with domain $D_p(A) = \{x \in L^p(0, 1); Ax \in L^p(0, 1)\}$. Note the inclusion $D_p(A) \subset D_q(A) \subset D(A)$ for $p \geq q \geq 2$.

The operator A generates an analytic semigroup $(e^{tA})_{t \geq 0}$ on $L^p(0, 1)$, for every $p \in [2, \infty)$, see for instance [38]. In the case $p = 2$, we have the following formula: $e^{tA} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} e^{-t\lambda_i} \langle \cdot, e_i \rangle e_i$ for every $x \in H$ and $t \geq 0$.

We use the standard construction of fractional powers $(-A)^{-\alpha}$ and $(-A)^\alpha$ of A , for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, see for instance [38]:

$$\begin{aligned} (-A)^{-\alpha} &= \frac{\sin(\pi\alpha)}{\pi} \int_0^\infty t^{-\alpha} (tI - A)^{-1} dt, \\ (-A)^\alpha &= \frac{\sin(\pi\alpha)}{\pi} \int_0^\infty t^{\alpha-1} (-A)(tI - A)^{-1} dt, \end{aligned}$$

where $(-A)^\alpha$ is defined as an unbounded linear operator on $L^p(0, 1)$, with domain $D_p((-A)^\alpha)$. Definitions are consistent when p varies. In the case $p = 2$, the construction is simple: indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} (-A)^{-\alpha} x &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*} \lambda_i^{-\alpha} \langle x, e_i \rangle e_i, \quad x \in H, \\ (-A)^\alpha x &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*} \lambda_i^\alpha \langle x, e_i \rangle e_i, \quad x \in D_2((-A)^\alpha) = \left\{ x \in H; \sum_{i=1}^\infty \lambda_i^{2\alpha} \langle x, e_i \rangle^2 < \infty \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We use the natural norms on $D_p((-A)^\alpha)$, denoted by $|(-A)^\alpha \cdot|_{L^p}$. They do not in general coincide with the norms of the standard Sobolev spaces $W^{2\alpha, p} = W^{2\alpha, p}(0, 1)$; see [44, Section 4.2.1] for their definitions. When 2α is not an integer, we may use the norm defined in [44, Section 4.4.1, Remark 2]. Nevertheless, for any $\epsilon > 0$, we have the following inequalities:

$$(8) \quad |x|_{W^{2\alpha-\epsilon, p}} \leq c_{\alpha, \epsilon, p} |(-A)^\alpha x|_{L^p}, \quad x \in D_p((-A)^\alpha) \quad ; \quad |(-A)^\alpha x|_{L^p} \leq c_{\alpha, \epsilon, p} |x|_{W^{\alpha+\epsilon, p}}, \quad x \in W^{2\alpha+\epsilon, p},$$

for $c_{\alpha, \epsilon, p} \in (0, \infty)$. These inequalities follow from combining several arguments from [44], and using the inclusion $D_p(A) \subset W^{2, p}$: see (3) from Section 1.15.2, (e) from Section 1.3.3, and (a), (b) from Section 4.6.1.

Moreover, the choice of norm on $W^{2\alpha, p}$ from [44, Section 4.4.1, Remark 2] immediatly yields the following inequality: for $\alpha < \frac{1}{2}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, any $x \in D_p((-A)^{\alpha+\epsilon})$, and any Lipschitz continuous function $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$(9) \quad |(-A)^\alpha g(x)|_{L^p} \leq c_{\alpha, \epsilon} |g(x)|_{W^{2\alpha+\epsilon, p}} \leq c_{\alpha, \epsilon} (g)(1 + |x|_{W^{2\alpha+\epsilon, p}}) \leq c_{\alpha, \epsilon} (g)(1 + |(-A)^{\alpha+\epsilon} x|_{L^p}).$$

Similarly, for $\alpha < \frac{1}{2}$, and $x \in W^{2\alpha, q}, y \in W^{2\alpha, r}$ such that $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{r}$, one has

$$(10) \quad |xy|_{W^{2\alpha, p}} \leq c_{\alpha, q, r} (|x|_{L^q} |y|_{W^{2\alpha, r}} + |x|_{W^{2\alpha, q}} |y|_{L^r}) \leq c_{\alpha, q, r} |x|_{W^{2\alpha, q}} |y|_{W^{2\alpha, r}};$$

Using then (8), (10) yields that for $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, $\epsilon > 0$, $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{r}$, and $x \in D_q((-A)^{\alpha+\epsilon}), y \in D_r((-A)^{\alpha+\epsilon})$, one has

$$(11) \quad |(-A)^\alpha xy|_{L^p} \leq c_{\alpha, \epsilon, q, r} |(-A)^{\alpha+\epsilon} x|_{L^q} |(-A)^{\alpha+\epsilon} y|_{L^r}.$$

We will use below a last inequality concerning products, where one of the factors is controlled in a negative space. For $\alpha < \frac{1}{2}$, $\epsilon > 0$, $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{r}$ and $x \in L^q, y \in D_r((-A)^{\alpha+\epsilon})$, one has

$$(12) \quad |(-A)^{-\alpha-\epsilon}(xy)|_{L^p} \leq c_{\alpha, \epsilon, q, r} |(-A)^{-\alpha} x|_{L^q} |(-A)^{\alpha+\epsilon} y|_{L^r}.$$

Let us give a proof of inequality (12). Let $z \in D_{p'}((-A)^{\alpha+\epsilon})$, where $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$, then

$$\langle xy, z \rangle = \langle (-A)^{-\alpha} x, (-A)^\alpha (yz) \rangle \leq |(-A)^{-\alpha} x|_{L^q} |(-A)^\alpha (yz)|_{L^{q'}},$$

where $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{q'} = 1$; note that $\frac{1}{q'} = \frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{p'}$. From (8) and (10), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |(-A)^\alpha (yz)|_{L^{q'}} &\leq c |yz|_{W^{2\alpha+\epsilon, q'}} \\ &\leq c |y|_{W^{2\alpha+\epsilon, r}} |z|_{W^{2\alpha+\epsilon, p'}} \\ &\leq c |(-A)^{\alpha+\epsilon} y|_{L^r} |(-A)^{\alpha+\epsilon} z|_{L^{p'}}. \end{aligned}$$

We finally conclude the proof of (12) thanks to the following inequality:

$$\langle xy, z \rangle \leq c |(-A)^{-\alpha} x|_{L^q} |(-A)^{\alpha+\epsilon} y|_{L^r} |(-A)^{\alpha+\epsilon} z|_{L^{p'}}.$$

The drift coefficient G is the sum of a Nemytskii and of a Burgers type nonlinearities: $G = F_1 + BF_2$, where $Bx = \partial_\xi x \in L^p(0, 1)$ for $x \in W^{1, p}(0, 1)$, and where F_1 and F_2 are Nemytskii coefficients. Precisely, let $\tilde{F}_1, \tilde{F}_2 \in \mathcal{C}_b^3(\mathbb{R})$ be two real-valued functions. We assume moreover that they are bounded, to simplify the

presentation, but this should not be seen as a restrictive assumption. Then define, for every $x \in L^p$, with $p \in [1, \infty]$, $F_i(x)(\cdot) = \tilde{F}_i(x(\cdot))$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

Straightforward applications of Hölder's inequality yield Property 2.2 below.

Property 2.2. *Let $F \in \{F_1, F_2\}$.*

For every $p \in [1, \infty]$, there exists $C_p \in (0, \infty)$ such that for every $x \in L^2, h \in L^p$

$$|F(x)|_{L^p} \leq C_p \quad , \quad |F'(x).h|_{L^p} \leq C_p |h|_{L^p};$$

moreover, if $q_1, q_2, r_1, r_2, r_3 \in [1, \infty]$ are such that $\frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2} = \frac{1}{p}$ and $\frac{1}{r_1} + \frac{1}{r_2} + \frac{1}{r_3} = \frac{1}{p}$, there exists $C_p(q_1, q_2)$ and $C_p(r_1, r_2, r_3)$ such that for every $x \in L^2$

$$|F^{(2)}(x).(h_1, h_2)|_{L^p} \leq C_p(q_1, q_2) |h_1|_{L^{q_1}} |h_2|_{L^{q_2}}, \quad \forall h_1 \in L^{q_1}, h_2 \in L^{q_2}$$

$$|F^{(3)}(x).(h_1, h_2, h_3)|_{L^p} \leq C_p(r_1, r_2, r_3) |h_1|_{L^{r_1}} |h_2|_{L^{r_2}} |h_3|_{L^{r_3}}, \quad \forall h_1 \in L^{r_1}, h_2 \in L^{r_2}, h_3 \in L^{r_3}.$$

In order to control terms of the form $BF_2(x)$, we will use the following property

$$(13) \quad |(-A)^{-\alpha} B(-A)^{-\beta}|_{\mathcal{L}(L^p)} < \infty, \quad \text{for } \alpha + \beta > \frac{1}{2}.$$

Indeed, this inequality is a direct consequence of (8) when $\alpha = 0$, and uses a duality argument when $\beta = 0$. The general case follows by an interpolation argument.

The diffusion coefficient σ is a linear operator of Nemytskii type. Precisely, let $\tilde{\sigma} \in \mathcal{C}_b^3(\mathbb{R})$ be a real-valued, bounded, function, with bounded derivatives up to order 3. Then, for every $p \in [1, \infty]$, define $(\sigma(x)h)(\cdot) = \tilde{\sigma}(x(\cdot))h(\cdot)$ for all $x, h \in L^p$.

To state the regularity estimates on the derivatives of σ which will be used below, we need the following result.

Lemma 2.3. *For every $p \in [2, \infty)$, there exists $C(p) \in (0, \infty)$ such that for every $x \in D((-A)^{\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{2p}})$*

$$(14) \quad |x|_{L^p} \leq C(p) |(-A)^{\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{2p}} x|_{L^2}.$$

Proof. The standard Sobolev inequality gives $|x|_{L^p} \leq C(p) |x|_{W^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}, 2}}$. To conclude, we use the fact that, for $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{4})$, the norms $|\cdot|_{W^{2\alpha, 2}}$ and $|(-A)^\alpha \cdot|_{L^2}$ are equivalent on $D((-A)^\alpha)$. \square

Property 2.4. *For every $p, q \in [1, \infty]$, $\sigma : L^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(L^p, L^q)$ is of class \mathcal{C}^3 . Moreover, the following conditions on the derivatives of σ hold true.*

For every $p \in [2, \infty]$, there exists $C_p \in (0, \infty)$ such that for every $x \in L^2$

$$|\sigma(x)|_{\mathcal{L}(L^p)} \leq C_p.$$

For every $p \in [2, \infty)$, there exists $C_p \in (0, \infty)$ such that for every $x \in L^2$

$$(15) \quad |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2p}} (\sigma'(x).h)|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \leq C_p |h|_{L^p}, \quad \forall h \in L^p,$$

$$(16) \quad |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2p}} (\sigma''(x).(h, k))|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \leq C_p |h|_{L^{2p}} |k|_{L^{2p}}, \quad \forall h, k \in L^{2p},$$

$$(17) \quad |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2p}} (\sigma^{(3)}(x).(h, k_1, k_2))|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \leq C_p |h|_{L^{2p}} |k_1|_{L^{4p}} |k_2|_{L^{4p}}, \quad \forall h \in L^{2p}, k_1, k_2 \in L^{4p}.$$

Finally, for every $x \in L^2$ and $h \in L^p, k_1, k_2 \in L^{2p}$

$$(18) \quad \sigma(x)^* = \sigma(x) \quad , \quad (\sigma'(x).h)^* = \sigma'(x).h \quad , \quad (\sigma''(x).(k_1, k_2))^* = \sigma''(x).(k_1, k_2).$$

We sketch the proof of (15), the two other estimates (16) and (17) are obtained in the same way. For every $y, z \in L^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (\sigma'(x).h)y, (-A)^{-\frac{1}{2p}} z \rangle &\leq C |h|_{L^p} |y|_{L^2} |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2p}} z|_{L^r} \\ &\leq C |h|_{L^p} |y|_{L^2} |(-A)^{\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{2r} - \frac{1}{2p}} z|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

thanks to Hölder's inequality, with $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{2}$, and inequality (14).

When no confusion is possible, we will often use the notations F_i for \tilde{F}_i , and σ for $\tilde{\sigma}$.

2.3. Test functions. We now give the regularity assumptions on the test functions φ . Typically, φ is only defined on $L^q(0, 1)$, for some $q \in [2, \infty)$. Considering regularized version φ_δ , defined in Assumption 2.5 below, allows us to consider functions defined and regular on $H = L^2(0, 1)$.

Assumption 2.5. *For every $\delta \in (0, 1)$, define $\varphi_\delta(\cdot) = \varphi(e^{\delta A} \cdot)$. We assume that φ_δ is of class \mathcal{C}^3 on H , for every $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Moreover, we assume that the derivatives satisfy the following conditions, uniformly with respect to $\delta \in (0, 1)$: there exists $p, q \in [2, \infty)$, $K \in \mathbb{N}^* \cup \{0\}$, and $C(p, q, K) \in (0, \infty)$ such that for every $x \in L^p$, and $h_1, h_2, h_3 \in L^q$*

$$(19) \quad \begin{aligned} |D\varphi_\delta(x).h_1| &\leq C(p, q, K)(1 + |x|_{L^p})^K |h_1|_{L^q}, \\ |D^2\varphi_\delta(x).(h_1, h_2)| &\leq C(p, q, K)(1 + |x|_{L^p})^K |h_1|_{L^q} |h_2|_{L^q}, \\ |D^3\varphi_\delta(x).(h_1, h_2, h_3)| &\leq C(p, q, K)(1 + |x|_{L^p})^K |h_1|_{L^q} |h_2|_{L^q} |h_3|_{L^q}. \end{aligned}$$

Interesting examples of test functions φ are constructed as follows. Let $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^3(\mathbb{R})$ a function of class \mathcal{C}^3 ; we assume that the derivatives of ϕ have at most polynomial growth. Define

$$\varphi(x) = \int_0^1 \phi(x(\xi)) d\xi,$$

for $x \in L^n(0, 1)$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ is such that $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{|\varphi'(x)|}{(1+|x|)^n} < \infty$.

Since derivatives of φ take the form $D^{(n)}\varphi(x).(h_1, \dots, h_n) = \phi^{(n)}(x(\cdot))h_1(\cdot) \dots h_n(\cdot)$, Assumption 2.5 is satisfied by applying Hölder's inequality, with appropriately chosen parameters p, q .

If we assume that the derivatives of ϕ are bounded, we may choose $K = 0$ and $p = 2$; the estimate on the third order derivative requires to choose $q = 3$.

2.4. Elements of Malliavin calculus. We recall basic definitions regarding Malliavin calculus, which is a key tool for the analysis provided below; especially, we define the Malliavin derivative, and state the integration by parts formula which will be used. We simply aim at giving the main notation; for a comprehensive treatment of Malliavin calculus, we refer to the classical monograph [33].

Malliavin calculus techniques will be required for both contributions of this article: first the proof of new regularity estimates for the solution of Kolmogorov equations associated to SPDEs with nonlinear diffusion coefficient, and second the analysis of weak convergence rates for the numerical discretization of the SPDE. For the first part, we will only use discrete time versions of all objects, which are based on standard integration by parts in the weighted L^2_ρ spaces, where ρ is the Gaussian density. The full generality of Malliavin calculus, in continuous time, is mainly needed in the second part.

Given a smooth real-valued function G on H^n and $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n \in L^2(0, T; H)$, the Malliavin derivative of the smooth random variable $G(\int_0^T \langle \psi_1(r), dW(r) \rangle, \dots, \int_0^T \langle \psi_n(r), dW(r) \rangle)$, at time s , in the direction $h \in H$, is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_s^h G &\left(\int_0^T \langle \psi_1(r), dW(r) \rangle, \dots, \int_0^T \langle \psi_n(r), dW(r) \rangle \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \partial_i G \left(\int_0^T \langle \psi_1(r), dW(r) \rangle, \dots, \int_0^T \langle \psi_n(r), dW(r) \rangle \right) \langle \psi_i(s), h \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

We also define the process $\mathcal{D}G$ by $\langle \mathcal{D}G(s), h \rangle = \mathcal{D}_s^h G$. It can be shown that \mathcal{D} defines a closable operator with values in $L^2(\Omega \times (0, T); H)$, and we denote by $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ the closure of the set of smooth random variables for the norm

$$\|G\|_{\mathbb{D}^{1,2}} = \left(\mathbb{E}(|G|^2) + \int_0^T |\mathcal{D}_s G|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

We define similarly the Malliavin derivative of random variables taking values in H . If $G = \sum_i G_i e_i \in L^2(\Omega, H)$ with $G_i \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $\sum_i \int_0^T |\mathcal{D}_s^h G_i|^2 ds < \infty$, we set

$$\mathcal{D}_s^h G = \sum_i \mathcal{D}_s^h G_i e_i, \quad \mathcal{D}_s G = \sum_i \mathcal{D}_s G_i e_i.$$

The chain rule is valid: if $u \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R})$ and $G \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$, then $u(G) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ and $\mathcal{D}(u(G)) = u'(G)\mathcal{D}G$.

For $G \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ and $\psi \in L^2(\Omega \times (0, T); H)$, such that $\psi(t) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ for all $t \in [0, T]$, and such that $\int_0^T \int_0^T |\mathcal{D}_s \psi(t)|^2 ds dt < \infty$, we have the Malliavin integration by parts formula:

$$\mathbb{E} \left(G \int_0^T (\psi(s), dW(s)) \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T (\mathcal{D}_s G, \psi(s)) ds \right) = \sum_i \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T \mathcal{D}_s^{e_i} G (\psi(s), e_i) ds \right),$$

where the stochastic integral is in general a Skohorod integral. However, in this article, it corresponds with the Itô integral since we only need to consider the Skohorod integral of adapted processes. Moreover, the integration by parts formula above holds for $G \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ and $\psi \in L^2(\Omega \times (0, T); H)$ when ψ is an adapted process.

Recall that if G is \mathcal{F}_t measurable, then $\mathcal{D}_s G = 0$ for $s \geq t$.

Finally, we use the following integration by parts formula, see Lemma 2.1 in [16]: let $G \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$, $u \in C_b^2(H)$ and $\psi \in L^2(\Omega \times (0, T), \mathcal{L}_2(H))$ be an adapted process, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(Du(G) \cdot \int_0^T \psi(s) dW(s) \right) &= \sum_i \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T D^2 u(G) \cdot (\mathcal{D}_s^{e_i} G, \psi(s) e_i) ds \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T \text{Tr} (\psi^*(s) D^2 u(G) \mathcal{D}_s G) ds \right). \end{aligned}$$

3. MAIN RESULTS

We consider the stochastic evolution equation (1), which we recall here:

$$(20) \quad dX_t = AX_t dt + G(X_t) dt + \sigma(X_t) dW(t), \quad X(0) = x,$$

where $x \in H$ is an arbitrary initial condition.

For every time $T \in (0, \infty)$, equation (20) admits a unique mild solution in $C([0, T]; H)$, i.e. $X = (X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is a H -valued continuous stochastic process such that for every $0 \leq t \leq T$

$$(21) \quad X_t = e^{tA} x + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} G(X_s) ds + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \sigma(X_s) dW(s),$$

where the H -valued stochastic integral is interpreted in Itô sense. We refer for instance to [14] for a proof of this standard result.

To emphasize on the influence of the initial condition x , we often use the notation $X(t, x)$. However, in many computations we omit this dependence and write X_t for simplicity.

A rigorous treatment of the problem is made easier by considering regularized coefficients G_δ and σ_δ , for $\delta > 0$, defined as follows:

$$G_\delta = e^{\delta A} G(e^{\delta A} \cdot) = e^{\delta A} F_1(e^{\delta A} \cdot) + B e^{\delta A} F_2(e^{\delta A} \cdot) \quad , \quad \sigma_\delta = e^{\delta A} \sigma(e^{\delta A} \cdot) e^{\delta A}.$$

It is straightforward to check that Properties 2.2 and 2.4 are preserved after regularization, with constants which are uniform with respect to δ . Indeed, on the one hand, $e^{\delta A}$ is bounded with norm equal to 1, from L^p to L^p , for every $p \in [1, \infty]$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$; on the other hand, for $\delta > 0$, $e^{\delta A}$ is also a bounded operator from L^2 to L^p for $p > 2$, and thus the regularized coefficients F_δ and σ_δ are \mathcal{C}_b^3 on H (but with norm depending on δ). Note that B and $e^{\delta A}$ do not commute.

Remark 3.1. We cannot use standard regularization methods in our setting, such as spectral Galerkin projections, like in [16]. Indeed, the associated projection operators are not uniformly bounded (with respect to dimension), in L^p spaces for $p > 2$.

The regularization we use in this article does not provide finite dimensional approximation of the process.

Alternatively, the not so different regularization proposed in [22] (see Lemma 3.1) may be used. It is based on an additional truncation of modes larger than $N(\delta)$, in the definition of $e^{\delta A}$, for a well-chosen integer $N(\delta)$.

In the computations below, we often omit to mention the dependance on δ . All the estimates we state and prove are uniform in δ .

Working with regularized coefficients F_δ and σ_δ , with $\delta \in (0, 1)$, we introduce the regularized SPDE

$$(22) \quad dX_t^\delta = AX_t^\delta dt + G_\delta(X_t^\delta)dt + \sigma_\delta(X_t^\delta)dW(t), \quad X^\delta(0) = x.$$

When $\delta \rightarrow 0$, X^δ converges (in a suitable sense) to X . Consistently, the notation $X^0 = X$ will be used.

For every $\delta \in (0, 1)$, introduce the function $u_\delta : [0, T] \times L^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined by

$$(23) \quad u_\delta(t, x) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi_\delta(X^\delta(t, x))],$$

and the function $u : [0, T] \times L^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$(24) \quad u(t, x) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X(t, x))].$$

The function u_δ , resp. u , is formally solution of the Kolmogorov equations associated to (22), resp. (20). As already mentioned, the regularity results proved in this article could be used to prove that these functions are in fact strict solutions of these Kolmogorov equations.

Consistently, we use the notation $u_0 = u$. Indeed, results on u will be obtained from results proved for $\delta > 0$ and passing to the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$.

Thanks to [2] or [8], for every $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $t \geq 0$, $u_\delta(t, \cdot)$ is a function of class \mathcal{C}^3 on L^2 .

3.1. Regularity estimates on the derivatives of the Kolmogorov equation solution. The first main results of this article are new estimates on the first and second order spatial derivatives of u .

For our results given below, we consider the setting of section 2.2 and section 2.3. Note that all the results are valid for the parameter q , defined in Assumption 2.5, satisfying $q \in [2, \infty)$. The proofs of the cases $q = 2$ and $q \in (2, \infty)$ need to be treated separately. We only provide detailed proofs in the case $q \in (2, \infty)$. The case $q = 2$ is easier.

Theorem 3.2. *For every $\beta \in [0, 1)$ and $T \in (0, \infty)$, there exists $C_\beta(T)$, such that for every $\delta \in [0, 1)$, $t \in (0, T]$, $x \in L^p$ and $h \in L^q$*

$$(25) \quad |Du_\delta(t, x) \cdot h| \leq \frac{C_\beta(T)}{t^\beta} (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} |(-A)^{-\beta} h|_{L^{2q}}.$$

This result can be interpreted as a regularization property: for every $t > 0$ and $\beta \in (0, 1)$, we have $(-A)^\beta Du(t, x) \in L^r$, compared with $Du(0, x) \in L^r$, where r is the conjugated exponent of $2q$, i.e. $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{2q} = 1$.

Theorem 3.2 is not difficult for $\beta \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$ (see [2], [16]). Getting the result for $\beta \in [0, 1)$ with standard arguments is possible only in the case of additive noise. We recall below in Section 4.1 where the limitation $\beta < \frac{1}{2}$ comes from in direct approaches, when σ is nonlinear. Then we give a formal description of our strategy of proof of Theorem 3.2 and introduce new arguments.

We now turn to the result on D^2u , which is also a regularization property.

Theorem 3.3. *For every $\beta, \gamma \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $T \in (0, \infty)$, there exists $C_{\beta, \gamma}(T)$, such that for every $\delta \in [0, 1)$, $t \in (0, T]$, $x \in L^p$ and $h_1, h_2 \in L^{4q}$*

$$(26) \quad |D^2u_\delta(t, x) \cdot (h_1, h_2)| \leq \frac{C_{\beta, \gamma}(T)}{t^{\beta+\gamma}} (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} |(-A)^{-\beta} h_1|_{L^{4q}} |(-A)^{-\gamma} h_2|_{L^{4q}}.$$

Again, the novelty in Theorem 3.3 is the range $[0, \frac{1}{2})$ for the parameters β and γ . More precisely, we remove the restriction $\beta + \gamma < \frac{1}{2}$, for which a direct proof works, see [2], [16].

Another novelty is that we consider SPDEs with a spatial derivate in the nonlinear term. Moreover, Nemytskii type diffusion and nonlinear terms are allowed. This requires bounds depending on L^q norms and not only on L^2 norms.

Remark 3.4. *The presence of L^{2q} and L^{4q} norms in the right-hand side of (25) and (26) is not optimal. A careful inspection of the proof reveals that norms on the right-hand side may be replaced with weaker $L^{q+\epsilon}$ and $L^{2q+\epsilon}$ norms, where ϵ is arbitrarily close to 0. Moreover, at the price of increasing the singularity in T , one may use the Markov property to get estimates which depend on L^r with much smaller r .*

The main motivation and application of Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 3.3 is the analysis of weak convergence rates for numerical discretizations of the SPDE (20). For that purpose, being able to choose both β and γ arbitrarily close to $\frac{1}{2}$ is fundamental. Theorem 3.2 with $\beta \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$ is sufficient to consider the case with $F_2 = 0$, but we need β close to 1 to treat the Burger's type nonlinearity BF_2 .

In the additive noise case, it is possible to choose $\beta, \gamma \in [0, 1)$, such that $\beta + \gamma < 1$ in Theorem 3.3. Then we may choose for instance $\beta \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, and this simplifies several arguments in the weak convergence analysis - and also in the argument presented below to give a meaning to the trace term in (3). We believe that the same strategy as for the proof of Theorem 3.2 can be adapted to prove that indeed the conclusion of Theorem 3.3 is still valid for $\beta, \gamma \in [0, 1)$ with $\beta + \gamma < 1$. Substantial generalizations of the arguments are however required, and they will be studied in future works.

In addition to the analysis of weak convergence errors, Theorems 3.2 and 3.3 can be used to give a meaning to the different terms in the right-hand side of (3). First the terms $\langle Ax, Du(t, x) \rangle$ has a meaning as soon as $|(-A)^{1-\beta}x|_{L^q} < \infty$, for β arbitrarily close to 1. Choosing $\beta > \frac{3}{4}$ is fundamental, since the solution $X(t, x)$ takes values in $D_q((-A)^\alpha)$ only for $\alpha < \frac{1}{4}$. The term $\langle G(x), Du(t, x) \rangle = \langle F_1(x) + BF_2(x), Du(t, x) \rangle$ is well-defined also, choosing $\beta > \frac{1}{2}$ thanks to (13). The trace term is more delicate. Thanks to Theorem 3.3, for $\beta, \gamma \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $x \in L^p$ we have

$$\text{Tr}(\sigma(x)\sigma^*(x)D^2u(t, x)) = \sum_n D^2u(t, x) \cdot (\sigma^2(x)e_n, e_n),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_n |D^2u(t, x) \cdot (\sigma^2(x)e_n, e_n)| &\leq \frac{C_{\beta, \gamma}(T)}{t^{\beta+\gamma}} (1 + |x|_{L^p}^K) \sum_n |(-A)^{-\beta}(\sigma^2(x)e_n)|_{L^{4q}} |(-A)^{-\gamma}e_n|_{L^{4q}} \\ &\leq \frac{C_{\beta, \gamma}(T)}{t^{\beta+\gamma}} (1 + |x|_{L^p}^K) \sum_n |(-A)^{-\beta}(\sigma^2(x)e_n)|_{L^{4q}} \lambda_n^{-\gamma}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} |e_n|_{L^{4q}} < \infty$ thanks to Property 2.1.

Nevertheless, taking $\gamma < \frac{1}{2}$ arbitrarily close to $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\beta = 0$ is not sufficient, since $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} \lambda_n^{-\gamma} = \infty$. To overcome this issue, we use (12), then (9):

$$|(-A)^{-\beta}(\sigma^2(x)e_n)|_{L^{4q}} \leq c|(-A)^\beta \sigma^2(x)|_{L^{8q}} |(-A)^{-\beta+\epsilon}e_n|_{L^{8q}} \leq c(1 + |(-A)^{\beta+\epsilon}x|_{L^{8q}}) |(-A)^{-\beta+\epsilon}e_n|_{L^{8q}}.$$

We choose $\gamma, \beta \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\gamma + \beta - \epsilon > \frac{1}{2}$:

$$\sum_n |D^2u(t, x) \cdot (\sigma^2(x)e_n, e_n)| \leq \frac{C_{\beta, \gamma}(T)}{t^{\beta+\gamma}} (1 + |x|_{L^p}^K) (1 + |(-A)^{\beta+\epsilon}x|_{L^{8q}}) \sum_n \lambda_n^{-\gamma-\beta+\epsilon}.$$

Note that it is possible to choose β, ϵ arbitrarily close to 0. Therefore the trace term in (3) is meaningful as soon as $x \in D_{8q}((-A)^\alpha)$ for some $\alpha > 0$. Again the exponent $8q$ is not optimal.

For completeness, we also state a regularity result on the third order derivatives of u_δ . This result is useful to prove the two results above and in the analysis of the weak convergence rate for numerical approximations below. Contrary to Theorems 3.2 and 3.3, since we consider a restrictive range for the parameters α, β, γ , *i.e.* with the constraint $\alpha + \beta + \gamma < 1/2$, standard arguments are sufficient and the proof is left to the reader. The arguments used for Theorems 3.2 and 3.3 could be naturally extended to generalize Proposition 3.5, under appropriate assumptions, as well as to higher order derivatives. We leave the study of such generalizations to future works.

Proposition 3.5. *For every $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$ such that $\alpha + \beta + \gamma < \frac{1}{2}$, and $T \in (0, \infty)$, there exists $C_\beta(T)$, such that for every $\delta \in (0, 1)$, $h_1, h_2, h_3 \in L^{3q}$*

$$(27) \quad |D^3u_\delta(t, x) \cdot (h_1, h_2, h_3)| \leq \frac{C_\beta(T)}{t^\beta} (1 + |x|_{L^p}^K) |(-A)^{-\alpha}h_1|_{L^{3q}} |(-A)^{-\beta}h_2|_{L^{3q}} |(-A)^{-\gamma}h_3|_{L^{3q}}.$$

The results in Theorems 3.2, 3.3 are proved for the function u_δ , defined by (23), for $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Thanks to the result on the third order derivatives of u_δ , we may take the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$ in Theorems 3.2 and 3.3; this provides Gâteaux differentiability of first and second order of the function u , at points $x \in L^p$ and in directions $h_1, h_2 \in L^q$.

If φ is a C^2 function on H satisfying Assumption 2.5 with $p = 2 = q = 2$, using standard arguments, we can prove similar estimates on $D^k u_\delta$, $k = 1, 2, 3$ with $\beta = \gamma = 0$ for $x \in H$ and $h, h_1, h_2, h_3 \in H$. Thus in this case, we can prove that u is a C^2 function on H .

3.2. Weak convergence of numerical approximations. As an application of the results of section 3.1, we study the discretization of (20) by the following semi-implicit Euler scheme (also known as the linear implicit Euler scheme). Let $T \in (0, \infty)$ be given, and let $\Delta t \in (0, T)$ denote the time-step size of the scheme, such that $N = \frac{T}{\Delta t} \in \mathbb{N}^*$ is an integer.

Then for $n \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$, define

$$(28) \quad X_{n+1} - X_n = \Delta t (AX_{n+1} + G(X_n)) + \sigma(X_n)(W((n+1)\Delta t) - W(n\Delta t)), \quad X_0 = x.$$

The nonlinear terms G and σ are treated explicitly (which is possible thanks to global Lipschitz continuity assumptions), whereas the linear operator A is treated implicitly. Note that (61) can be rewritten in an explicit form

$$X_{n+1} = S_{\Delta t} X_n + \Delta t S_{\Delta t} G(X_n) + S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_n)(W((n+1)\Delta t) - W(n\Delta t)),$$

where $S_{\Delta t} = (I - \Delta t A)^{-1}$. This proves the well-posedness of the scheme, thanks to nice regularization properties of $S_{\Delta t}$, see Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3.

The weak convergence result is given by Theorem 3.6; its proof is given in Section 5. It generalizes the statement that the weak rate, equal to $\frac{1}{2}$, is twice the strong order $\frac{1}{4}$, which has been obtained for instance in [39]. Recall that the values of p, q and K are determined by Assumption 2.5.

Theorem 3.6. *For every $\kappa \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, $T \in (0, \infty)$ and every $\Delta t_0 \in (0, 1)$, there exists $C_\kappa(T, \Delta t_0, \varphi)$, such that for every $\Delta t \in (0, \Delta t_0)$, with $N = \frac{T}{\Delta t} \in \mathbb{N}^*$, for every $x \in L^p \cap L^{2q}$*

$$(29) \quad |\mathbb{E}\varphi(X(T)) - \mathbb{E}\varphi(X_N)| \leq C_\kappa(T, \Delta t_0, \varphi) (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 8q)}})^{K+3} \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}.$$

The proof is a generalization of [16], with several non trivial modifications, due to the assumptions made on the drift and diffusion coefficients. In this article, we work in L^p spaces, and it seems that it is the first time that a weak convergence result is provided for SPDEs with Burgers type drift coefficients, *i.e.* with a spatial derivative in the drift nonlinear term. More importantly, our main contribution is the treatment of non constant diffusion coefficients σ (the multiplicative noise case), under realistic assumptions. In particular, we drop the artificial assumption on σ from [16].

As mentioned in the introduction, the approach using mild Itô calculus, see [9], [24], [25], [26], has also recently been able to deal with such non constant diffusion coefficients. The main difference is in the way the discretization error is analyzed: our approach is in our opinion somewhat simpler, and closer to the standard approaches from finite dimensional cases. We require also lower regularity on the drift and diffusion terms.

Our proof is based on a decomposition of the error depending on the solution u of the Kolmogorov equation. In particular, Theorem 3.2 (to handle Burgers type nonlinear drift coefficients), resp. Theorem 3.3 (to handle nonlinear diffusion coefficients), removing the condition $\beta < \frac{1}{2}$, resp. the condition $\beta + \gamma < \frac{1}{2}$, are essential tools.

4. PROOF OF THE REGULARITY ESTIMATES

4.1. Formal arguments in continuous time. In this section, we explain how Theorems 3.2 and 3.3 are obtained. We first recall the origins of the limitations on parameters β and γ in standard approaches. We then present the strategy of the proof, in particular what are the two-sided stochastic integrals that are required.

As explained in the introduction, we do not intend to give a rigorous meaning in the continuous time setting to the objects introduced below, and do not justify the computations. In order to simplify the presentation, since we want to focus on the difficulties due to the diffusion coefficient σ being non constant, in this section we assume that $F_1 = F_2 = 0$. Moreover, we work in an abstract setting: we assume that the diffusion coefficient σ is a function on H of class \mathcal{C}^2 , with bounded derivatives – this property not being true for the Nemystkii coefficients considered in this paper. We also assume that the test function φ is of class \mathcal{C}_b^2 .

First, differentiating (24), we obtain for $h \in H$:

$$Du(t, x).h = \mathbb{E}[D\varphi(X(t, x)).\eta^{h,x}(t)]$$

where $\eta^{h,x}(t)$ is the solution of

$$d\eta^{h,x}(t) = A\eta^{h,x}(t)dt + \sigma'(X(t, x)).\eta^{h,x}(t)dW(t), \eta^{h,x}(0) = h.$$

Using the mild formulation of $\eta^{h,x}(t)$ and Itô's isometry,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\eta^{h,x}(t)|^2 &= \mathbb{E}\left|e^{tA}h + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A}\sigma'(X(s, x)).\eta^{h,x}(s)dW(s)\right|^2 \\ &= |e^{tA}h|^2 + \int_0^t |e^{(t-s)A}\sigma'(X(s, x)).\eta^{h,x}(s)|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}^2 ds \\ &\leq Ct^{-2\beta}|(-A)^{-\beta}h|^2 + C \int_0^t (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}\mathbb{E}|\eta^{h,x}(s)|^2 ds. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, for $y, h \in H$ and $\kappa \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$

$$\left|e^{A(t-s)}\sigma'(y).k\right|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}^2 \leq \left|e^{A(t-s)}\right|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}^2 |\sigma'(y).k|_{\mathcal{L}(H)}^2 \leq C \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*} e^{-2\lambda_i(t-s)} |k|^2 \leq c(t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa} |k|^2,$$

since $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*} \lambda_i^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa} < \infty$. Assuming that $2\beta < 1$, and applying Gronwall's Lemma, we get

$$\sup_{t \in (0, T]} t^{2\beta} \mathbb{E} \left(|\eta^{h,x}(t)|^2 \right) \leq |(-A)^{-\beta}h|^2,$$

which then yields the required regularity result, for $\beta \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$:

$$|Du(t, x) \cdot h| \leq c\|\varphi\|_1 t^{-\beta} |(-A)^{-\beta}h|.$$

The limitation $\beta < \frac{1}{2}$ in previous articles thus comes from the fact that Itô's formula is used to control the stochastic integral, and naturally squares appear in integrals. In the additive noise case, since $\sigma' = 0$, no stochastic integral appears in the definition of $\eta^{h,x}(t)$, and thus choosing $\beta \in [0, 1)$ is possible.

A similar difficulty appears for the second order derivative: differentiating twice (24), for $h, k \in H$ yields

$$D^2u(t, x).(h, k) = \mathbb{E} \left[D^2\varphi(X(t, x)).(\eta^{h,x}(t), \eta^{k,x}(t)) + D\varphi(X(t, x)).\zeta^{h,k,x}(t) \right],$$

where $\zeta^{h,k,x}(t)$ is the solution of

$$d\zeta^{h,k,x}(t) = A\zeta^{h,k,x}(t)dt + \sigma'(X(t, x)).\zeta^{h,k,x}(t)dW(t) + \sigma''(X(t, x)).(\eta^{h,x}(t), \eta^{k,x}(t))dW(t),$$

with the initial condition $\zeta^{h,k,x}(0) = 0$. The issue lies again in the control of the stochastic integral: indeed, Itô's isometry for the mild formulation of the equation gives

$$\mathbb{E}|\zeta^{h,k,x}(t)|^2 \leq C \int_0^t (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa} (\mathbb{E}|\zeta^{h,k,x}(s)|^2 + \mathbb{E}[|\eta^{h,x}(s)|^2 |\eta^{k,x}(s)|^2]) ds,$$

and, generalizing the previous estimate on η to handle the fourth moment, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|\eta^{h,x}(s)|^2 |\eta^{k,x}(s)|^2] \leq Cs^{-2\beta-2\gamma} |(-A)^{-\beta}h|^2 |(-A)^{-\gamma}k|^2,$$

and $\int_0^t (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa} s^{-2\beta-2\gamma} ds < \infty$ if and only if $\beta + \gamma < \frac{1}{2}$. Under this condition, we obtain

$$|D^2u(t, x).(h, k)| \leq Ct^{-\beta-\gamma} |(-A)^{-\beta}h| |(-A)^{-\gamma}k|.$$

In order to overcome the limitations on β and γ , we introduce new formulas for Du and for D^2u . The idea is to use Malliavin integration by parts formula, in order to replace stochastic Itô's integrals, which require temporal square integrability properties, with deterministic integrals, which require only temporal integrability.

First, define $\tilde{\eta}^{h,x}(t) = \eta^{h,x}(t) - e^{tA}h$, and write

$$Du(t, x).h = \mathbb{E}(D\varphi(X(t, x)).e^{tA}h + D\varphi(X(t, x)).\tilde{\eta}^{h,x}(t)).$$

The first term on the right-hand side is easily bounded by $t^{-\beta}|(-A)^{-\beta}h|$, for $\beta \in [0, 1)$. To control the second term, note that

$$d\tilde{\eta}^{h,x}(t) = \left(A\tilde{\eta}^{h,x}(t)dt + \sigma'(X(t,x))\cdot\tilde{\eta}^{h,x}dW(t) \right) + \sigma'(X(t,x))\cdot e^{tA}hdW(t).$$

Formally, $\zeta^{h,k,x}$ and $\tilde{\eta}^{h,x}$ are the solutions of the same type of equations, and we have the following expressions (at least at a formal level)

$$(30) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{\eta}^{h,x}(t) &= \int_0^t \Pi(t,s)\sigma'(X(s,x))\cdot e^{sA}hdW(s), \\ \zeta^{h,x}(t) &= \int_0^t \Pi(t,s)\sigma''(X(s,x)) \cdot (\eta^{h,x}(s), \eta^{h,x}(s))dW(s), \end{aligned}$$

where $\Pi(t,s)$ is the evolution operator associated with the linear equation

$$dZ_{t,s} = AZ_{t,s}dt + \sigma'(X(t,x))\cdot Z_{t,s}dW(t) \quad , \quad Z_{s,s} = z,$$

i.e. $\Pi(t,s)z = Z_{t,s}$. The difficulty of course comes from the randomness of $\Pi(t,s)$, so that the stochastic integrals in (30) are not defined as standard Itô integrals. Indeed, $\Pi(t,s)$ is not adapted as a function of s . As explained in the introduction, it may be possible to adapt the arguments from [1], [34], [35], [36] and [37] and give a rigorous meaning to (30). This is not the strategy we follow; instead, we work on time-discrete approximations of the problem, for which every object is easily defined and only standard tools of stochastic analysis are used.

Once a precise meaning to (30) is provided, it remains to use Malliavin integration by parts formula to get rid of the stochastic integrals. Only integrability in time is required for $\Pi(t,s)\sigma'(X(s,x))\cdot e^{sA}h$ and $\Pi(t,s)\sigma''(X(s,x)) \cdot (\eta^{h,x}(s), \eta^{h,x}(s))$, instead of square integrability in previous approaches. This allows to choose $\beta \in [0, 1)$ (resp. $\beta, \gamma \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$) in the estimate on the first order derivative (resp. the second order derivative).

4.2. Discrete time approximation. In order to give a rigorous meaning to the arguments presented above in Section 4.1, we replace the continuous time processes $(X^\delta(t))_{t \in [0,T]}$, with $\delta \in [0, 1)$, with discrete-time approximations. We use a numerical scheme, with time-step size $\Delta t = \frac{T}{N} \in (0, 1)$, with $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$. We prove regularity results for fixed N , with upper bounds not depending on N , and finally pass to the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$.

We also require an additional regularization parameter, $\tau \in (0, 1)$. Some estimates depend on τ ; when it is the case, it will always be stated precisely.

The discrete-time processes are defined using the linear-implicit Euler scheme: for $0 \leq n \leq N-1$

$$(31) \quad X_{n+1}^{\delta, \tau, \Delta t} = S_{\Delta t}X_n^{\delta, \tau, \Delta t} + \Delta t S_{\Delta t}G_\delta(X_n^{\delta, \tau, \Delta t}) + e^{\tau A}S_{\Delta t}\sigma_\delta(X_n^{\delta, \tau, \Delta t})\Delta W_n,$$

with the standard notation $\Delta W_n = W((n+1)\Delta t) - W(n\Delta t)$, and $S_{\Delta t} = (I - \Delta t A)^{-1}$. Note that we have added the regularization operator in the diffusion coefficient: $e^{\tau A}$.

The remainder of this section is devoted to statements and proofs of some results concerning $|(-A)^\beta S_{\Delta t}^n|_{\mathcal{L}(L^p)}$ and $|(-A)^\beta S_{\Delta t}^n|_{R(L^2, L^p)}$. Their are used to get a priori estimates on moments of X_n .

Lemma 4.1. *For every $p \in [2, \infty)$, $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{4})$, $M \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $T \in (0, \infty)$, there exists $C(p, M, T)$, such that for every $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ (with $N\Delta t = T$), and every $x \in D_p((-A)^\alpha)$*

$$(32) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|(-A)^\alpha X_n(x)|_{L^p}^{2M} &\leq C(p, \alpha, M, T)(1 + t_n^{-\alpha}|x|_{L^p}^{2M}), \\ \mathbb{E}|(-A)^\alpha X_n(x)|_{L^p}^{2M} &\leq C(p, \alpha, M, T)(1 + |(-A)^\alpha x|_{L^p}^{2M}). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.2. *For every $\beta \in [0, 1)$ and $p \in [2, \infty)$, there exists $C(p, \beta)$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$*

$$|(-A)^\beta S_{\Delta t}^n|_{\mathcal{L}(L^p)} \leq \frac{C(p, \beta)}{t_n^\beta}.$$

Lemma 4.3. *For every $\beta \in [0, \frac{3}{4})$, $p \in [2, \infty)$, and $\kappa \in (0, \frac{3}{4} - \beta)$, there exists $C_\kappa(p, \beta)$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$*

$$|(-A)^\beta S_{\Delta t}^n|_{R(L^2, L^p)} \leq \frac{C_\kappa(p, \beta)}{t_n^{\frac{1}{4} + \beta + \kappa}}.$$

Both results in the case $p = 2$ are obtained by straightforward computations, thanks to expansions using the eigenbasis $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ of A . When $p \in (2, \infty)$, the arguments use properties of the analytic semigroup $(e^{tA})_{t \geq 0}$ in L^p . The proofs are given below since these results are not standard in the literature for SPDEs. Arguments from [38] are used. The results are in fact valid for $p \in (1, \infty)$.

Proof of Lemma 4.2. The case $\beta = 0$ follows from the two inequalities $|S_{\Delta t}|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \leq 1$ (which is proved using expansions in the Hilbert space L^2 with the complete orthonormal system $(e_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}^*}$) and $|S_{\Delta t}|_{\mathcal{L}(L^\infty)} \leq 1$. By a standard interpolation argument, we thus have $|S_{\Delta t}^{n+1}|_{\mathcal{L}(L^p)} \leq 1$ for every $p \in [2, \infty]$.

Define the resolvent $R(\lambda, A) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} e^{tA} dt$, for $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$. Then $S_{\Delta t} = \frac{1}{\Delta t} R(\frac{1}{\Delta t}, A)$. First, for $x \in L^p$, we set $y = S_{\Delta t} x$. Then $|y|_{L^q} \leq |x|_{L^q}$, and $Ay = \frac{1}{\Delta t}(y - x)$. We thus obtain

$$|Ay|_{L^q} = |AS_{\Delta t} x|_{L^q} \leq \frac{2}{\Delta t} |x|_{L^q}.$$

Second, when $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$,

$$\begin{aligned} n! |(-A)R(\lambda, A)^{n+1} x|_{L^p} &= \left| \int_0^\infty t^n e^{-\lambda t} (-A) e^{tA} x dt \right|_{L^p} \\ &\leq C(p, \beta) \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} t^{n-1} dt |x|_{L^p} \\ &\leq C(p, \beta) (n-1)! \lambda^{-n} |x|_{L^p}. \end{aligned}$$

This gives $|(-A)S_{\Delta t}^{n+1}|_{\mathcal{L}(L^p)} \leq \frac{C(p, \beta)}{(n+1)\Delta t}$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Thus the result is proved for $\beta = 1$. The case $\beta \in [0, 1)$ follows by a standard interpolation argument:

$$|(-A)^\beta S_{\Delta t}^{n+1} x|_{L^p} \leq |(-A)S_{\Delta t}^{n+1} x|_{L^p}^\beta |S_{\Delta t}^{n+1} x|_{L^p}^{1-\beta} \leq \frac{C(p, \beta)}{((n+1)\Delta t)^\beta} |x|_{L^p}.$$

This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.2. □

Proof of Lemma 4.3. Let $(\tilde{\gamma}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ denote a sequence of independent standard real-valued Gaussian random variables, $\tilde{\gamma}_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

Then, using standard properties concerning moments of Gaussian random variables,

$$\begin{aligned} |(-A)^\beta S_{\Delta t}^n|_{R(L^2, L^p)}^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_k \gamma_k (-A)^\beta S_{\Delta t}^n e_k \right|_{L^p}^2 \\ &\leq \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \sum_k \gamma_k (-A)^\beta S_{\Delta t}^n e_k \right|_{L^p}^p \right)^{\frac{2}{p}} \\ &\leq \left(\int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_k \lambda_k^\beta \frac{1}{(1 + \lambda_k \Delta t)^n} e_k(\xi) \gamma_k \right|^p d\xi \right)^{\frac{2}{p}} \\ &\leq \left(\int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \sum_k \lambda_k^\beta \frac{1}{(1 + \lambda_k \Delta t)^n} e_k(\xi) \gamma_k \right|^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} d\xi \right)^{\frac{2}{p}} \\ &\leq \left(\int_0^1 \left(\sum_k \lambda_k^{2\beta} \frac{1}{(1 + \lambda_k \Delta t)^{2n}} e_k(\xi)^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} d\xi \right)^{\frac{2}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using Property 2.1, and the estimate

$$\sum_k \lambda_k^{2\beta} \frac{1}{(1 + \lambda_k \Delta t)^{2n}} \leq \sum_k \lambda_k^{-\frac{1}{2} - 2\kappa} |(-A)^{\frac{1}{4} + \kappa + \beta} S_{\Delta t}^n e_k|_{L^2}^2 \leq C_\kappa t_n^{-\frac{1}{2} - 2\kappa - 2\beta},$$

which follows from Lemma 4.2, we get the result. □

Proof of Lemma 4.1. First, note that, for $0 \leq n \leq N$,

$$(33) \quad X_n = S_{\Delta t}^n x + \Delta t \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} S_{\Delta t}^{n-k} BG(X_k) + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} S_{\Delta t}^{n-k} e^{\tau A} \sigma(X_k) \Delta W_k.$$

Thanks to Property 2.2, inequality (13), and Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3, we have for $\kappa > 0$ such that $2\alpha + 2\kappa < \frac{1}{2}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|(-A)^\alpha X_n|_{L^p}^2 &\leq C|(-A)^\alpha S_{\Delta t}^n x|_{L^p}^2 + C\left(\Delta t \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} |(-A)^{\alpha+\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} S_{\Delta t}^{n-k}|_{\mathcal{L}(L^p)}\right)^2 \\ &\quad + C\mathbb{E}\left|\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (-A)^\alpha S_{\Delta t}^{n-k} e^{\tau A} \sigma(X_k) \Delta W_k\right|_{L^p}^2 \\ &\leq C t_n^{-2\alpha} |x|_{L^p}^2 + C\left(\Delta t \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} t_{n-\ell}^{-\frac{1}{2}-2\alpha-\kappa}\right)^2 + C\Delta t \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}|(-A)^\alpha S_{\Delta t}^{n-k} e^{\tau A} \sigma(X_k)|_{R(L^2, L^p)}^2 \\ &\leq C(1 + t_n^{-2\alpha} |x|_{L^p}^2) + C\Delta t \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} |(-A)^\alpha S_{\Delta t}^{n-k}|_{R(L^2, L^p)}^2 \mathbb{E}|e^{\tau A} \sigma(X_k)|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)}^2 \\ &\leq C(1 + t_n^{-2\alpha} |x|_{L^p}^2 + \Delta t \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} t_{n-k}^{-\frac{1}{2}-2\alpha-2\kappa}). \end{aligned}$$

This proves (32) in the case $M = 1$. The case $M \geq 1$ and the second estimate of (32) are obtained with similar computations combined with standard arguments. This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.1. \square

4.3. Derivatives in the discrete-time framework. We now repeat the discussion of section 4.1 in the discrete-time framework and turn the formal arguments into rigorous ones.

Define the function $u^{\delta, \tau, \Delta t} : \{0, \Delta t, \dots, (N-1)\Delta t, N\Delta t = T\} \times H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, by

$$(34) \quad u^{\delta, \tau, \Delta t}(n\Delta t, x) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi_\delta(X_n^{\delta, \tau, \Delta t}(x))],$$

where $X_n^{\delta, \tau, \Delta t}(x)$ is the solution of (31) with initial condition x .

Thanks to the regularity properties of $G = F_1 + BF_2$, σ and φ , see Properties 2.2, 2.4 and Assumption 2.5, for every $n \in \{0, 1, \dots, N\}$, $x \in L^2 \mapsto u^{\delta, \tau, \Delta t}(t_n, x)$ is of class \mathcal{C}^2 , and it is easy to prove recursively that:

- the first order derivative satisfies

$$(35) \quad Du^{\delta, \tau, \Delta t}(t_n, x).h = \mathbb{E}[D\varphi_\delta(X_n(x)).\eta_n^h]$$

with $\eta_0^h = h$ and, for $n \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$,

$$(36) \quad \eta_{n+1}^h = S_{\Delta t} \eta_n^h + \Delta t S_{\Delta t} G'_\delta(X_n). \eta_n^h + S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} (\sigma'_\delta(X_n). \eta_n^h) \Delta W_n.$$

- the second order derivative satisfies

$$(37) \quad D^2 u^{\delta, \tau, \Delta t}(t_n, x).(h, k) = \mathbb{E}[D^2 \varphi_\delta(X_n(x)).(\eta_n^h, \eta_n^k)] + \mathbb{E}[D\varphi_\delta(X_n(x)).\zeta_n^{h, k}],$$

with $\zeta_0^{h, k} = 0$ and, for $n \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$,

$$(38) \quad \begin{aligned} \zeta_{n+1}^{h, k} &= S_{\Delta t} \zeta_n^{h, k} + \Delta t S_{\Delta t} G'_\delta(X_n). \zeta_n^{h, k} + S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} (\sigma'_\delta(X_n). \zeta_n^{h, k}) \Delta W_n \\ &\quad + \Delta t S_{\Delta t} G''_\delta(X_n).(\eta_n^h, \eta_n^k) + S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} (\sigma''_\delta(X_n).(\eta_n^h, \eta_n^k)) \Delta W_n. \end{aligned}$$

Define the auxiliary process $(\tilde{\eta}_n^h)_{0 \leq n \leq N}$, by

$$(39) \quad \tilde{\eta}_n^h = \eta_n^h - S_{\Delta t}^n h \quad , \quad \tilde{\eta}_0^h = 0.$$

In order to simplify the notation, most of the time we will not mention the parameters $\delta, \tau, \Delta t$.

Our objective is to obtain the following estimates, with arbitrarily small $\kappa \in (0, 1)$:

$$(40) \quad \begin{aligned} |Du^{\delta, \tau, \Delta t}(T, x).h| &\leq \frac{C_{\beta, \kappa}(T)}{T^{\beta} \tau^{\kappa}} (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} |(-A)^{-\beta} h|_{L^{2q}}, \quad \beta \in [0, 1), \\ |D^2 u^{\delta, \tau, \Delta t}(T, x).(h, k)| &\leq \frac{C_{\beta, \gamma, \kappa}(T)}{T^{\beta + \gamma} \tau^{\kappa}} (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} |(-A)^{-\beta} h|_{L^{4q}} |(-A)^{-\gamma} k|_{L^{4q}}, \quad \beta, \gamma \in [0, \frac{1}{2}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that the right-hand sides do not depend on Δt and on δ . Passing to the limit when these parameters go to 0 is straightforward. To remove the parameter τ , interpolation arguments are used.

As explained in Section 4.1, the formal expressions of $\tilde{\eta}(t)$ and $\zeta(t)$, given by (30), are essential to improve these regularity results. Contrary to the continuous time situation, in the discrete time framework there is no difficulty to obtain and give a rigorous meaning to such expressions, see (44) below.

Define random linear operators $(\Pi_n)_{0 \leq n \leq N-1}$ as follows: for every $n \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$ and every $z \in H$

$$(41) \quad \Pi_n z = S_{\Delta t} z + \Delta t S_{\Delta t} B e^{\tau A} G'(X_n).z + S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} (\sigma'(X_n).z) \Delta W_n.$$

Note that $\Pi_n = \Pi(X_n, \Delta W_n)$ with the deterministic linear operators $\Pi(x, w)$ defined by

$$\Pi(x, w)z = S_{\Delta t} z + \Delta t S_{\Delta t} B e^{\tau A} F'(x).z + S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} (\sigma'(x).z)w.$$

We emphasize on the following key observation: Π_n depends on the Wiener increments $\Delta W_0, \dots, \Delta W_{n-1}$ only through the first variable of $\Pi(\cdot, \cdot)$, and depends on ΔW_n only through its second variable.

Introduce the notation $\Pi_{n-1:\ell} = \Pi_{n-1} \dots \Pi_{\ell}$ for $\ell \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, and by convention $\Pi_{n-1:n} = I$. These operators are the discrete versions of the evolution operators $\Pi(t, s)$ formally introduced in Section 4.1.

Recursion formulas for η^h , $\tilde{\eta}^h$ and $\zeta^{h,k}$, are rewritten in the following forms:

$$(42) \quad \begin{aligned} \eta_{n+1}^h &= \Pi_n \eta_n^h, \quad \eta_0^h = h, \\ \tilde{\eta}_{n+1}^h &= \Pi_n \tilde{\eta}_n^h + \Delta t S_{\Delta t} G'(X_n).S_{\Delta t}^n h + S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} (\sigma'(X_n).S_{\Delta t}^n h) \Delta W_n, \\ \zeta_{n+1}^{h,k} &= \Pi_n \zeta_n^{h,k} + \Delta t S_{\Delta t} G''(X_n).(\eta_n^h, \eta_n^k) + S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} (\sigma''(X_n).(\eta_n^h, \eta_n^k)) \Delta W_n \end{aligned}$$

A straightforward consequence of the first equality in (42) is the equality

$$(43) \quad \eta_n^h = \Pi_{n-1:0} h,$$

for every $n \in \{0, \dots, N\}$. Moreover, we get the following discrete-time analogs of (30), now taking into account also nonlinear drift terms:

$$(44) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{\eta}_n^h &= \Delta t \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} \Pi_{n-1:\ell+1} S_{\Delta t} G'(X_{\ell}).S_{\Delta t}^{\ell} h + \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} \Pi_{n-1:\ell+1} S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} (\sigma'(X_{\ell}).S_{\Delta t}^{\ell} h) \Delta W_{\ell}, \\ \zeta_n^{h,k} &= \Delta t \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} \Pi_{n-1:\ell+1} S_{\Delta t} G''(X_{\ell}).(\eta_{\ell}^h, \eta_{\ell}^k) + \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} \Pi_{n-1:\ell+1} S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} (\sigma''(X_{\ell}).(\eta_{\ell}^h, \eta_{\ell}^k)) \Delta W_{\ell}. \end{aligned}$$

We treat separately the contributions of the drift and diffusion terms and introduce

$$(45) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{\eta}_n^{h,1} &= \Delta t \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} \Pi_{n-1:\ell+1} S_{\Delta t} G'(X_{\ell}).S_{\Delta t}^{\ell} h, \quad \tilde{\eta}_n^{h,2} = \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} \Pi_{n-1:\ell+1} S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} (\sigma'(X_{\ell}).S_{\Delta t}^{\ell} h) \Delta W_{\ell}; \\ \zeta_n^{h,k,1} &= \Delta t \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} \Pi_{n-1:\ell+1} S_{\Delta t} G''(X_{\ell}).(\eta_{\ell}^h, \eta_{\ell}^k), \quad \zeta_n^{h,k,2} = \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} \Pi_{n-1:\ell+1} S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} (\sigma''(X_{\ell}).(\eta_{\ell}^h, \eta_{\ell}^k)) \Delta W_{\ell}. \end{aligned}$$

Using $\eta_n^h = S_{\Delta t}^n h + \tilde{\eta}_n^{h,1} + \tilde{\eta}_n^{h,2}$, we obtain the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} Du^{\delta, \tau, \Delta t}(T, x).h &= \mathbb{E}[D\varphi(X_N).(S_{\Delta t}^N h)] + \mathbb{E}[D\varphi(X_N).\tilde{\eta}_N^{h,1}] + \mathbb{E}[D\varphi(X_N).\tilde{\eta}_N^{h,2}] \\ &= \mathcal{D}_N^{h,0} + \mathcal{D}_N^{h,1} + \mathcal{D}_N^{h,2}, \end{aligned}$$

where to simplify the notation we denote φ instead of φ_{δ} .

We also obtain the following decomposition for the second-order derivative:

$$\begin{aligned} D^2 u^{\delta, \tau, \Delta t}(T, x) \cdot (h, k) &= \mathbb{E}[D^2 \varphi(X_N) \cdot (\eta_N^h, \eta_N^k)] + \mathbb{E}[D\varphi(X_N) \cdot \zeta_N^{h, k, 1}] + \mathbb{E}[D\varphi(X_N) \cdot \zeta_N^{h, k, 2}] \\ &= \mathcal{E}_N^{h, k, 0} + \mathcal{E}_N^{h, k, 1} + \mathcal{E}_N^{h, k, 2}. \end{aligned}$$

The term $\mathcal{D}_N^{h, 0}$ is straightforward to estimate using Lemma 4.2. The terms $\mathcal{E}_N^{h, k, 0}$, $\mathcal{D}_N^{h, 1}$ and $\mathcal{E}_N^{h, k, 1}$ are not very difficult thanks to Lemma 4.4 stated below.

Finally, the terms $\mathcal{D}_N^{h, 2}$ and $\mathcal{E}_N^{h, k, 2}$ contain the discretized two-sided stochastic integrals and are treated using a Malliavin integration by parts formula. Note that in the discrete time setting, this Malliavin integration by parts formula can simply be considered as a standard integration by parts formula in the weighted L^2 space corresponding with Gaussian density.

Let us first consider the first order derivative term $\mathcal{D}_N^{h, 2}$. Introducing the adjoint $\Pi_{N-1:\ell+1}^*$ of the operator $\Pi_{N-1:\ell+1}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_N^{h, 2} &= \mathbb{E}[\langle D\varphi(X_N), \sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} \Pi_{N-1:\ell+1} S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} (\sigma'(X_\ell) \cdot S_{\Delta t}^\ell h) \Delta W_\ell \rangle] \\ &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} \mathbb{E}[\langle \Pi_{N-1:\ell+1}^* D\varphi(X_N), \int_{\ell\Delta t}^{(\ell+1)\Delta t} S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} (\sigma'(X_\ell) \cdot S_{\Delta t}^\ell h) dW(s) \rangle] \\ &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} \mathcal{D}_{N,\ell}^{h, 2}. \end{aligned}$$

We now perform the Malliavin integration by parts formula, and we get for every $\ell \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{N,\ell}^{h, 2} &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*} \mathbb{E} \int_{\ell\Delta t}^{(\ell+1)\Delta t} \langle \mathcal{D}_s^{e_i} (\Pi_{N-1:\ell+1}^* D\varphi(X_N)), e^{\tau A} S_{\Delta t} (\sigma'(X_\ell) \cdot S_{\Delta t}^\ell h) e_i \rangle ds \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*} \mathbb{E} \int_{\ell\Delta t}^{(\ell+1)\Delta t} \mathcal{D}_s^{e_i} \langle D\varphi(X_N), \Pi_{N-1:\ell+1} e^{\tau A} S_{\Delta t} (\sigma'(X_\ell) \cdot S_{\Delta t}^\ell h) e_i \rangle ds \\ &= \mathcal{D}_{N,\ell}^{h, 2, 1} + \mathcal{D}_{N,\ell}^{h, 2, 2}, \end{aligned}$$

where, thanks to the chain rule,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{N,\ell}^{h, 2, 1} &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*} \mathbb{E} \int_{\ell\Delta t}^{(\ell+1)\Delta t} D^2 \varphi(X_N) \cdot (\mathcal{D}_s^{e_i} X_N, \Pi_{N-1:\ell+1} e^{\tau A} S_{\Delta t} (\sigma'(X_\ell) \cdot S_{\Delta t}^\ell h) e_i) ds, \\ \mathcal{D}_{N,\ell}^{h, 2, 2} &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*} \mathbb{E} \int_{\ell\Delta t}^{(\ell+1)\Delta t} \langle D\varphi(X_N), \mathcal{D}_s^{e_i} (\Pi_{N-1:\ell+1} e^{\tau A} S_{\Delta t} (\sigma'(X_\ell) \cdot S_{\Delta t}^\ell h) e_i) \rangle ds \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

Similarly, for the second order derivative term $\mathcal{E}_N^{h, k, 2}$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_N^{h, k, 2} &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} \mathbb{E}[\langle D\varphi(X_N), \Pi_{N-1:\ell+1} S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} (\sigma''(X_\ell) \cdot (\eta_\ell^h, \eta_\ell^k)) \Delta W_\ell \rangle] \\ &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} \mathbb{E}[\langle \Pi_{N-1:\ell+1}^* D\varphi(X_N), \int_{\ell\Delta t}^{(\ell+1)\Delta t} S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} (\sigma''(X_\ell) \cdot (\eta_\ell^h, \eta_\ell^k)) dW(s) \rangle] \\ &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} (\mathcal{E}_{N,\ell}^{h, k, 2, 1} + \mathcal{E}_{N,\ell}^{h, k, 2, 2}), \end{aligned}$$

with

$$(47) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{N,\ell}^{h,k,2,1} &= \sum_i \mathbb{E} \int_{\ell\Delta t}^{(\ell+1)\Delta t} D^2\varphi(X_N) \cdot \left(\mathcal{D}_s^{e_i} X_N, \Pi_{N-1:\ell+1} e^{\tau A} S_{\Delta t} (\sigma''(X_\ell) \cdot (\eta_\ell^h, \eta_\ell^k)) e_i \right) ds, \\ \mathcal{E}_{N,\ell}^{h,k,2,2} &= \sum_i \mathbb{E} \int_{\ell\Delta t}^{(\ell+1)\Delta t} \langle D\varphi(X_N), \mathcal{D}_s^{e_i} \left(\Pi_{N-1:\ell+1} e^{\tau A} S_{\Delta t} (\sigma''(X_\ell) \cdot (\eta_\ell^h, \eta_\ell^k)) e_i \right) \rangle ds. \end{aligned}$$

To go further, we see that we need estimates on the random operators $\Pi_{N-1:\ell+1}$, and on the Malliavin derivatives $\mathcal{D}_s X_N$ and $\mathcal{D}_s \Pi_{N-1:\ell+1}$, for $s \in (\ell\Delta t, (\ell+1)\Delta t)$. Lemmas 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6 are proved in Section 4.4 below.

Lemma 4.4. *For any $q \in [2, \infty)$, $M \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $T \in (0, \infty)$, and $\beta \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$, $\gamma \in [0, \frac{1}{4})$ if $q = 2$ and $\gamma \in [0, \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{2q})$ for $q \neq 2$, there exists $C_{\beta,\gamma}(M, q, T)$, such that for any $0 \leq \ell < n \leq N$, and any $\sigma(\Delta W_0, \dots, \Delta W_{\ell-1})$ -measurable random vector z_ℓ , then*

$$(48) \quad (\mathbb{E} |(-A)^\gamma \Pi_{n-1:\ell} z_\ell|_{L^q}^{2M})^{\frac{1}{2M}} \leq C_{\beta,\gamma}(M, p, T) t_{n-\ell}^{-\beta-\gamma} (\mathbb{E} |(-A)^{-\beta} z_\ell|_{L^q}^{2M})^{\frac{1}{2M}}.$$

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\ell \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, and $s \in (\ell\Delta t, (\ell+1)\Delta t)$. Then*

$$(49) \quad \mathcal{D}_s X_n = \Pi_{n-1:\ell+1} S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} \sigma(X_\ell).$$

Lemma 4.6. *For any $q \in (2, \infty)$, $\kappa \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, and $T \in (0, \infty)$, there exists $C_\kappa(q, T) \in (0, \infty)$, such that for any $0 \leq \ell < N-1$, any $s \in (\ell\Delta t, (\ell+1)\Delta t)$, any $z \in L^{2q}$ and any $\sigma(\Delta W_0, \dots, \Delta W_{\ell-1})$ -measurable random vector θ_ℓ , then*

$$(50) \quad \mathbb{E} |\mathcal{D}_s^{\theta_\ell} \Pi_{n-1:\ell+1} z|_{L^q}^2 \leq C_\kappa(q, T) (\mathbb{E} |\theta_\ell|_{L^{2q}}^4)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\Delta t \left(1 + \frac{1}{t_{n-\ell-1}^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{q} + \kappa}} \right) |z|_{L^{2q}}^2 + \mathbb{1}_{n>\ell+2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t_{n-\ell-2}^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{q} + \kappa}} \right) |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2} + \kappa} z|_{L^{2q}}^2 \right).$$

Moreover, when $\ell = N-1$, $\mathcal{D}_s \Pi_{N-1:\ell+1} z = 0$.

In (50), the quantity $\mathcal{D}_s^{\theta_\ell} \Pi_{n-1:\ell+1} z$ is interpreted as the image of θ_ℓ by the linear operator $\mathcal{D}_s \Pi_{n-1:\ell+1} z$. The assumption that the random vector θ_ℓ is $\sigma(\Delta W_0, \dots, \Delta W_{\ell-1})$ -measurable is crucial.

4.4. Proof of the auxiliary lemmas.

Proof of Lemma 4.5. Thanks to (31), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} X_n &= S_{\Delta t}^{n-\ell} X_\ell + \Delta t S_{\Delta t}^{n-\ell} G(X_\ell) + S_{\Delta t}^{n-\ell} e^{\tau A} \sigma(X_\ell) \Delta W_\ell \\ &\quad + \Delta t \sum_{m=\ell+1}^{n-1} S_{\Delta t}^{n-m} G(X_m) + \sum_{m=\ell+1}^{n-1} S_{\Delta t}^{n-m} e^{\tau A} \sigma(X_m) \Delta W_m, \end{aligned}$$

where X_ℓ is $\sigma(\Delta W_0, \dots, \Delta W_{\ell-1})$ -measurable. Thus $\mathcal{D}_s X_\ell = 0$ for $s > \ell\Delta t$.

Moreover, $\mathcal{D}_s^\theta \Delta W_\ell = \theta$ and, for $m > \ell$, $\mathcal{D}_s^\theta \Delta W_m = 0$ for $s \in (\ell\Delta t, (\ell+1)\Delta t)$. Using the chain rule, we thus obtain, for $n > \ell$ and any $\theta \in H$,

$$\mathcal{D}_s^\theta X_n = S_{\Delta t}^{n-\ell} e^{\tau A} \sigma(X_\ell) \theta + \Delta t \sum_{m=\ell+1}^{n-1} S_{\Delta t}^{n-m} G'(X_m) \cdot \mathcal{D}_s^\theta X_m + \sum_{m=\ell+1}^{n-1} S_{\Delta t}^{n-m} e^{\tau A} (\sigma'(X_m) \mathcal{D}_s^\theta X_m) \Delta W_m,$$

which in turn gives $\mathcal{D}_s^\theta X_n = \Pi_{n-1} \mathcal{D}_s^\theta X_{n-1}$ by definition (41). Since $\mathcal{D}_s^\theta X_{\ell+1} = S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} \sigma(X_\ell)$, equality (49) is satisfied, and this concludes the proof of Lemma 4.5. \square

Lemmas 4.4 and 4.6 are both consequences of the following technical result.

Lemma 4.7. *Let $q \in [2, \infty)$, $M \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $T \in (0, \infty)$, and $\beta \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$. There exists $C_\beta(M, q, T)$ such that the following holds true.*

Let $\ell \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$ and consider a $\sigma(\Delta W_0, \dots, \Delta W_{\ell-1})$ -measurable random vector z_ℓ , and two sequences $(Z_n^j)_{n \geq \ell, j \in \{1,2\}}$, such that Z_n^j is $\sigma(\Delta W_0, \dots, \Delta W_{n-1})$ -measurable.

Define the sequence $(Y_n^\ell)_{\ell \leq n \leq N}$ by $Y_\ell^\ell = z_\ell$, and for $n > \ell$

$$Y_n^\ell = \Pi_{n-1} Y_{n-1}^\ell + \Delta t S_{\Delta t} G_{n-1} + S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} (\sigma''(X_{n-1}) \cdot (Z_{n-1}^1, Z_{n-1}^2)) \Delta W_{n-1},$$

with $G_{n-1} = G''(X_{n-1}) \cdot (Z_{n-1}^1, Z_{n-1}^2)$.

Then, when $q > 2$, and every $n \geq \ell + 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E}|Y_n^\ell|_{L^q}^{2M})^{\frac{1}{M}} &\leq C_\beta(M, q, T) \left(t_{n-\ell}^{-2\beta} (\mathbb{E}|(-A)^{-\beta} z_\ell|_{L^q}^{2M})^{\frac{1}{M}} + \Delta t \sum_{m=\ell}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t_{n-m}^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{q} + \kappa}}\right) \mathbb{E}(|Y_m^\ell|_{L^q}^{2M})^{\frac{1}{M}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \Delta t \sum_{m=\ell}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t_{n-m}^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{q} + \kappa}}\right) (\mathbb{E}|Z_n^1|_{L^{2q}}^{4M})^{\frac{1}{2M}} (\mathbb{E}|Z_n^2|_{L^{2q}}^{4M})^{\frac{1}{2M}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

When $q = 2$, for every $n \geq \ell + 1$

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E}|Y_n^\ell|^{2M})^{\frac{1}{M}} &\leq C_\beta(M, \kappa, T) \left(t_{n-\ell}^{-2\beta} (\mathbb{E}|(-A)^{-\beta} z_\ell|^{2M})^{\frac{1}{M}} + \Delta t \sum_{m=\ell}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t_{n-m}^{\frac{1}{2} + \kappa}}\right) \mathbb{E}(|Y_m^\ell|^{2M})^{\frac{1}{M}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \Delta t \sum_{m=\ell}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t_{n-m}^{\frac{1}{2} + \kappa}}\right) (\mathbb{E}|Z_n^1|_{L^4}^{4M})^{\frac{1}{2M}} (\mathbb{E}|Z_n^2|_{L^4}^{4M})^{\frac{1}{2M}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Before we give the proof of this result, let us mention that it will be useful when combined with the following discrete Gronwall's Lemma, see for instance Lemma 7.1 in [18] for details. Lemma 4.8 will also be used repeatedly in Section 5.

Lemma 4.8. Let $\mu, \nu \in (0, 1)$, and $T \in (0, \infty)$. Assume that $\Delta t = \frac{T}{N}$, for some $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$; for $1 \leq n \leq N$, let $t_n = n\Delta t$.

Assume that the sequence $(\phi_n)_{0 \leq n \leq N}$, with values in $(0, \infty)$, satisfies the following condition: there exists C_1, C_2 such that for every $1 \leq n \leq N$

$$\phi_n \leq C_1(1 + t_n^{-1+\mu}) + C_2 \Delta t \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} t_{n-j}^{-1+\nu} \phi_j.$$

Then there exists C such that $\phi_n \leq C(1 + t_n^{-1+\mu})$ for every $1 \leq n \leq N$.

We now give a detailed proof of Lemma 4.7. We only consider the case $q \in (2, \infty)$; the case $q = 2$ is treated with similar arguments, but with a slightly different treatment of the stochastic integral.

Proof of Lemma 4.7. Note that $Y_n^\ell = Y_n^{1,\ell} + Y_n^{2,\ell}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} Y_n^{1,\ell} &= S_{\Delta t}^{n-\ell} z_\ell + \Delta t \sum_{m=\ell}^{n-1} S_{\Delta t}^{n-m} F_1'(X_m) \cdot Y_m^\ell + \sum_{m=\ell}^{n-1} S_{\Delta t}^{n-m} e^{\tau A} (\sigma'(X_m) \cdot Y_m^\ell) \Delta W_m \\ &\quad + \Delta t \sum_{m=\ell}^{n-1} F_{n,1} + \sum_{m=\ell}^{n-1} S_{\Delta t}^{n-m} e^{\tau A} \sigma''(X_m) \cdot (Z_m^1, Z_m^2) \Delta W_m \end{aligned}$$

and

$$Y_n^{2,\ell} = \Delta t \sum_{m=\ell}^{n-1} S_{\Delta t}^{n-m} B F_2'(X_m) \cdot Y_m^\ell + \Delta t \sum_{m=\ell}^{n-1} S_{\Delta t}^{n-m} B F_{n,2},$$

where $F_{n,j} = F_j''(X_m) \cdot (Z_m^1, Z_m^2)$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$, are such that $G_{n-1} = F_{n-1,1} + B F_{n-1,2}$. By Property 2.2,

$$|F_{n,j}|_{L^q}^{2M} \leq C |Z_n^1|_{L^{2q}}^{2M} \mathbb{E} |Z_n^2|_{L^{2q}}^{2M}.$$

The quantity $Y_n^{1,\ell}$ is treated using properties of $S_{\Delta t}^n$ whereas energy inequalities are used for $Y_n^{2,\ell}$, which contains all the terms where the linear operator B appears.

Using a discrete time version of formula (7) and the corresponding Burkholder-Davies-Gundy inequality, as well as the ideal property (6), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}|Y_n^{1,\ell}|_{L^q}^{2M} &\leq C\mathbb{E}|S_{\Delta t}^{n-\ell}z_\ell|_{L^q}^{2M} + C\mathbb{E}\left(\Delta t \sum_{m=\ell}^{n-1} (|S_{\Delta t}^{n-m}F'_1(X_m) \cdot Y_m^\ell|_{L^q}^2 + |S_{\Delta t}^{n-m}e^{\tau A}(\sigma'(X_m) \cdot Y_m^\ell)|_{R(L^2, L^q)}^2)\right)^M \\
&\quad + C\mathbb{E}\left(\Delta t \sum_{m=\ell}^{n-1} (|S_{\Delta t}^{n-m}F_{m,1}|_{L^q}^2 + |S_{\Delta t}^{n-m}e^{\tau A}\sigma''(X_m) \cdot (Z_m^1, Z_m^2)|_{R(L^2, L^q)}^2)\right)^M \\
&\leq Ct_{n-\ell}^{-2\beta M}\mathbb{E}(-A)^{-\beta}z_\ell|_{L^q}^{2M} + C\mathbb{E}\left(\Delta t \sum_{m=\ell}^{n-1} (1 + |(-A)^{\frac{1}{2q}}S_{\Delta t}^{n-m}|_{R(L^2, L^q)}^2)\mathbb{E}|Y_m^\ell|_{L^q}^2\right)^M \\
&\quad + C\mathbb{E}\left(\Delta t \sum_{m=\ell}^{n-1} (1 + |(-A)^{\frac{1}{2q}}S_{\Delta t}^{n-m}|_{R(L^2, L^q)}^2)\mathbb{E}[|Z_m^1|_{L^{2q}}^2|Z_m^2|_{L^{2q}}^2]\right)^M,
\end{aligned}$$

thanks to Lemma 4.2 and Properties 2.2 and 2.4. Thanks to Lemma 4.3 and Minkowskii's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbb{E}|Y_n^{1,\ell}|_{L^q}^{2M})^{\frac{1}{M}} &\leq Ct_{n-\ell}^{-2\beta}\mathbb{E}(|(-A)^{-\beta}z_\ell|^{2M})^{\frac{1}{M}} + C\Delta t \sum_{m=\ell}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t_{n-m}^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{q} + \kappa}}\right)\mathbb{E}(|Y_m^\ell|_{L^q}^{2M})^{\frac{1}{M}} \\
&\quad + C\Delta t \sum_{m=\ell}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t_{n-m}^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{q} + \kappa}}\right)(\mathbb{E}[|Z_m^1|_{L^{2q}}^{4M}]\mathbb{E}[|Z_m^2|_{L^{2q}}^{4M}])^{\frac{1}{2M}}.
\end{aligned}$$

We then estimate $Y_n^{2,\ell}$ with an energy inequality. First, note that

$$Y_n^{2,\ell} - Y_{n-1}^{2,\ell} = \Delta t (AY_n^{2,\ell} + BF'_2(X_{n-1})Y_{n-1}^\ell + Be^{\tau A}F_{n-1,2}).$$

Then, multiply the above equation by $(Y_n^{2,\ell})^{q-1}$ and integrate in space. Recall that $A = \partial_{\xi\xi}$, $B = \partial_\xi$, and that homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions are imposed. Standard manipulations, including using Hölder's inequality and integration by parts, yield the following inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{q} \left(|Y_n^{2,\ell}|_{L^q}^q - |Y_{n-1}^{2,\ell}|_{L^q}^q \right) &\leq \Delta t \int_0^1 ((Y_n^{2,\ell})^{q-1}AY_n^{2,\ell} + B(F'_2(X_{n-1})Y_{n-1}^\ell + F_{n-1,2})(Y_n^{2,\ell})^{q-1})d\xi \\
&\leq -(q-1)\Delta t \int_0^1 (Y_n^{2,\ell})^{q-2}|\partial_\xi Y_n^{2,\ell}|^2 d\xi \\
&\quad + (q-1)\Delta t \int_0^1 (F'_2(X_{n-1})Y_{n-1}^\ell + F_{n-1,2})(Y_n^{2,\ell})^{q-2}\partial_\xi Y_n^{2,\ell} d\xi \\
&\leq -(q-1)\Delta t \int_0^1 (Y_n^{2,\ell})^{q-2}|\partial_\xi Y_n^{2,\ell}|^2 d\xi \\
&\quad + C\Delta t \int_0^1 ((Y_{n-1}^\ell)^2 + (F_{n-1,2})^2)(Y_n^{2,\ell})^{q-2}d\xi + \Delta t \int_0^1 (Y_n^{2,\ell})^{q-2}|\partial_\xi Y_n^{2,\ell}|^2 d\xi \\
&\leq C\Delta t \int_0^1 ((Y_{n-1}^\ell)^2 + (F_{n-1,2})^2)(Y_n^{2,\ell})^{q-2}d\xi.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that we work with regularized coefficients (with $\delta > 0$), so that $Y_n^{2,\ell}$ and Y_n^ℓ are sufficiently regular so that the computations above are rigorous.

Applying Hölder's inequality, then Lemma 4.8, we obtain

$$|Y_n^{2,\ell}|_{L^q}^q \leq c\Delta t \sum_{m=\ell}^{n-1} (|Y_m^\ell|_{L^q}^2 + |F_{m,2}|_{L^q}^2)|Y_{m+1}^{2,\ell}|_{L^q}^{q-2}.$$

Define $\bar{Y}_n^{2,\ell} = \sup_{m=\ell,\dots,n} |Y_m^{2,\ell}|_{L^q}$; then

$$|Y_n^{2,\ell}|_{L^q}^2 \leq (\bar{Y}_n^{2,\ell})^2 \leq C\Delta t \sum_{m=\ell}^{n-1} (|Y_m^\ell|_{L^q}^2 + |Z_m^1|_{L^{2q}}^2 |Z_m^2|_{L^{2q}}^2).$$

Finally, taking expectation and using Minkowskii's inequality yield

$$\mathbb{E}(|Y_n^{2,\ell}|_{L^q}^{2M})^{\frac{1}{2M}} \leq C\Delta t \sum_{m=\ell}^{n-1} \left(\mathbb{E}(|Y_m^\ell|_{L^q}^{2M})^{\frac{1}{2M}} + (\mathbb{E}(|Z_m^1|_{L^{2q}}^{4M}) \mathbb{E}(|Z_m^2|_{L^{2q}}^{4M}))^{\frac{1}{2M}} \right).$$

Gathering the estimates on $Y_n^{1,\ell}$ and $Y_n^{2,\ell}$ concludes the proof of Lemma 4.7. \square

Remark 4.9. For the case $q = 2$; the contribution of the stochastic integral needs to be treated differently. We have for instance, for any $\kappa \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$,

$$\begin{aligned} |S_{\Delta t}^{n-m} e^{\tau A} (\sigma'(X_m) \cdot Y_m^\ell)|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)}^2 &= \text{Tr} \left((\sigma'(X_m) \cdot Y_m^\ell)^2 S_{\Delta t}^{2(n-m)} e^{2\tau A} \right) \\ &= \sum_i |(\sigma'(X_m) \cdot Y_m^\ell)^2 \frac{e^{-\tau \lambda_i}}{(1 + \Delta t \lambda_i)^{n-m}} e_i|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq C |Y_m^\ell|_{L^2}^2 \sum_i \frac{1}{(1 + \Delta t \lambda_i)^{2(n-m)}} |e_i|_{L^\infty}^2 \\ &\leq C_\kappa |Y_m^\ell|_{L^2}^2 t_{n-m}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 4.4. For $\gamma = 0$, Lemma 4.4 is a straightforward consequence of Lemma 4.7 with $Z_n^1 = Z_n^2 = 0$ and of the discrete Gronwall's lemma, Lemma 4.8.

For $\gamma > 0$, we write, with $Y_n^\ell = \Pi_{n-1:\ell} z_\ell$,

$$Y_n^\ell = S_{\Delta t}^{n-\ell} z_\ell + \Delta t \sum_{m=\ell}^{n-1} S_{\Delta t}^{n-m} F_1'(X_m) \cdot Y_m^\ell + \sum_{m=\ell}^{n-1} S_{\Delta t}^{n-m} e^{\tau A} (\sigma'(X_m) \cdot Y_m^\ell) \Delta W_m,$$

and, thanks to Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3, and (13),

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E}(|(-A)^\gamma Y_n^\ell|_{L^q}^{2M})^{\frac{1}{2M}} &\leq c t_{n-\ell}^{-\beta-\gamma} \mathbb{E}(|(-A)^{-\beta} z_\ell|_{L^q}^{2M})^{\frac{1}{2M}} + c\Delta t \sum_{m=\ell}^{n-1} (t_{n-m}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa-\gamma} + 1) (\mathbb{E}|Y_m^\ell|_{L^q}^{2M})^{\frac{1}{2M}} \\ &\quad + c \left(\Delta t \sum_{m=\ell}^{n-1} t_{n-m}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q}-2\gamma-\kappa} (\mathbb{E}|Y_m^\ell|_{L^q}^{2M})^{\frac{1}{2M}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the estimate obtained for $\gamma = 0$, and the condition $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{q} + 2\gamma + \kappa < 1$, for sufficiently small $\kappa > 0$, then concludes the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.6. Again, we only treat the case $q \in (2, \infty)$.

Define $Y_n^\ell = \Pi_{n-1:\ell+1} z$, where $0 \leq \ell \leq n-1$. If $\ell = n-1$, $Y_n^\ell = z$, and thus for $s \in (\ell\Delta t, (\ell+1)\Delta t)$ one has $\mathcal{D}_s Y_{\ell+1}^\ell = 0$. If $n > \ell+1$,

$$Y_n^\ell = \Pi_{n-1} Y_{n-1}^\ell = S_{\Delta t} Y_{n-1}^\ell + \Delta t S_{\Delta t} G'(X_{n-1}) \cdot Y_{n-1}^\ell + S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} (\sigma'(X_{n-1}) \cdot Y_{n-1}^\ell) \Delta W_{n-1}.$$

Using the chain rule and the identity $\mathcal{D}_s \Delta W_{n-1} = 0$ for $s < (\ell+1)\Delta t \leq (n-1)\Delta t$, for every $\theta \in H$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_s^\theta Y_n^\ell &= S_{\Delta t} \mathcal{D}_s^\theta Y_{n-1}^\ell + \Delta t S_{\Delta t} G'(X_{n-1}) \cdot \mathcal{D}_s^\theta Y_{n-1}^\ell + S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} (\sigma'(X_{n-1}) \cdot \mathcal{D}_s^\theta Y_{n-1}^\ell) \Delta W_{n-1} \\ &\quad + \Delta t S_{\Delta t} G''(X_{n-1}) \cdot (\mathcal{D}_s^\theta X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1}^\ell) + S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} (\sigma''(X_{n-1}) \cdot (\mathcal{D}_s^\theta X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1}^\ell)) \Delta W_{n-1}, \end{aligned}$$

We apply Lemma 4.7, with ℓ replaced by $\ell + 1$, and $z_{\ell+1} = 0$, $Z_m^1 = \mathcal{D}_s^\theta X_m$, $Z_m^2 = Y_m^\ell$, and $M = 1$. This gives, for $n \geq \ell + 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{D}_s^{\theta_\ell} Y_n^\ell|_{L^q}^2 &\leq C\Delta t \sum_{m=\ell+1}^{n-1} (t_{n-m}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q}-\kappa} + 1) \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{D}_s^{\theta_\ell} Y_m^\ell|_{L^q}^2 \\ &\quad + C\Delta t \sum_{m=\ell+1}^{n-1} (t_{n-m}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q}-\kappa} + 1) (\mathbb{E}|\mathcal{D}_s^{\theta_\ell} X_m|_{L^{2q}}^4)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbb{E}|Y_m^\ell|_{L^{2q}}^4)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to Lemma 4.5 and Lemma 4.4, when $m > \ell + 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}|\mathcal{D}_s^{\theta_\ell} X_m|_{L^{2q}}^4 \leq C\mathbb{E}|\theta_\ell|_{L^{2q}}^4;$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}|Y_m^\ell|_{L^{2q}}^4 = \mathbb{E}|\Pi_{m-1:\ell+1} z|_{L^{2q}}^4 \leq C t_{m-\ell-1}^{-4(\frac{1}{2}-\kappa)} |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} z|_{L^{2q}}^4.$$

For $m = \ell + 1$, we use $\mathbb{E}|Y_{\ell+1}^\ell|_{L^{2q}}^4 = |z|_{L^{2q}}^4$.

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} C\Delta t \sum_{m=\ell+1}^{n-1} (1 + \frac{1}{t_{n-m}^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{q}+\kappa}}) (\mathbb{E}|\mathcal{D}_s^{\theta_\ell} X_m|_{L^{2q}}^4)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbb{E}|Y_m^\ell|_{L^{2q}}^4)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \leq C\Delta t (1 + \frac{1}{t_{n-\ell-1}^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{q}+\kappa}}) (\mathbb{E}|\theta_\ell|_{L^{2q}}^4)^{\frac{1}{2}} |z|_{L^{2q}}^2 \\ + C\Delta t \mathbb{1}_{n>\ell+2} \sum_{m=\ell+2}^{n-1} (1 + \frac{1}{t_{n-m}^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{q}+\kappa}}) \frac{1}{t_{m-\ell-1}^{1-2\kappa}} (\mathbb{E}|\theta_\ell|_{L^{2q}}^4)^{\frac{1}{2}} |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} z|_{L^{2q}}^2 \\ \leq C\Delta t (1 + \frac{1}{t_{n-\ell-1}^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{q}+\kappa}}) (\mathbb{E}|\theta_\ell|_{L^{2q}}^4)^{\frac{1}{2}} |z|_{L^{2q}}^2 \\ + C\mathbb{1}_{n>\ell+2} (1 + \frac{1}{t_{n-\ell-2}^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{q}-\kappa}}) (\mathbb{E}|\theta_\ell|_{L^{2q}}^4)^{\frac{1}{2}} |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} z|_{L^{2q}}^2, \end{aligned}$$

using a straightforward comparison between the series and an integral. Applying Lemma 4.8 concludes the proof. \square

4.5. Control of the derivatives.

4.5.1. *Estimate of $\mathcal{D}_N^{h,1}$ and of $\mathcal{E}_N^{h,k,1}$.* Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, Lemma 4.1, and Assumption 2.5 on φ , we have

$$|\mathcal{D}_N^{h,1}| \leq C(1 + |x|_{L^p})^K (\mathbb{E}|\tilde{\eta}_N^{h,1}|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad |\mathcal{E}_N^{h,k,1}| \leq C(1 + |x|_{L^p})^K (\mathbb{E}|\tilde{\zeta}_N^{h,k,1}|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and below we control the moments of $\tilde{\eta}_n^{h,1}$ and $\tilde{\zeta}_n^{h,k,1}$, for every $n \leq N$.

We treat $\mathcal{D}_N^{h,1}$ first. Thanks to (45), applying Lemma 4.4 gives, for $\kappa \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E}|\tilde{\eta}_n^{h,1}|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} &\leq C\Delta t \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} (\mathbb{E}|\Pi_{n-1:\ell+1} S_{\Delta t} G'(X_\ell) \cdot S_{\Delta t}^\ell h|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C_\kappa \Delta t \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} t_{n-\ell}^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} (\mathbb{E}|(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} S_{\Delta t} G'(X_\ell) \cdot S_{\Delta t}^\ell h|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C_\kappa \Delta t \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} t_{n-\ell}^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} (\mathbb{E}|F_1'(X_\ell) \cdot S_{\Delta t}^\ell h|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + C_\kappa \Delta t \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} t_{n-\ell}^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} (\mathbb{E}|(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} B F_2'(X_\ell) \cdot S_{\Delta t}^\ell h|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

By Property 2.2, we get

$$(\mathbb{E}|F'_1(X_\ell).S_{\Delta t}^\ell h|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C|S_{\Delta t}^\ell h|_{L^q} \leq C\mathbb{1}_{\ell \neq 0}t_\ell^{-\beta}|(-A)^{-\beta}h|_{L^q} + \mathbb{1}_{\ell=0}|h|_{L^q}.$$

As in the proof of Lemma 4.4, the presence of the operator B causes some difficulties. Using successively (13), (11), (8) and (9), and recalling that $F'_2(x).h = F'_2(x)h$ is a product,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E}|(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}BF'_2(X_\ell).S_{\Delta t}^\ell h|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} &\leq C(\mathbb{E}|(-A)^{2\kappa}F'_2(X_\ell).S_{\Delta t}^\ell h|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C\mathbb{E}(|(-A)^{3\kappa}F'_2(X_\ell)|_{L^{2q}}^2|(-A)^{3\kappa}S_{\Delta t}^\ell h|_{L^{2q}}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C(1 + \mathbb{E}|(-A)^{4\kappa}X_\ell|_{L^{2q}}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}|(-A)^{3\kappa}S_{\Delta t}^\ell h|_{L^{2q}}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\kappa > 0$ be such that $\beta + 7\kappa < 1$. Then, thanks to Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E}|\tilde{\eta}_n^{h,1}|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} &\leq Ct_n^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}\Delta t|h|_{L^q} + Ct_n^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa-\beta}|(-A)^{-\beta}h|_{L^q} \\ &\quad + Ct_n^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}\Delta t(1 + |(-A)^{4\kappa}x|_{L^{2q}})|(-A)^{3\kappa}h|_{L^{2q}} + Ct_n^{\frac{1}{2}-6\kappa-\beta}(1 + |x|_{L^{2q}})|(-A)^{-\beta}h|_{L^{2q}} \\ &\leq C\Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}(1 + |(-A)^{4\kappa}x|_{L^{2q}})|(-A)^{3\kappa}h|_{L^{2q}} + Ct_n^{\frac{1}{2}-6\kappa-\beta}(1 + |x|_{L^{2q}})|(-A)^{-\beta}h|_{L^{2q}}. \end{aligned}$$

and we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{D}_N^{h,1}| &\leq C\Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}(1 + |x|_{L^p})^K(1 + |(-A)^{4\kappa}x|_{L^{2q}})|(-A)^{3\kappa}h|_{L^{2q}} \\ &\quad + Ct_N^{\frac{1}{2}-6\kappa-\beta}(1 + |x|_{L^p})^K(1 + |x|_{L^{2q}})|(-A)^{-\beta}h|_{L^{2q}}. \end{aligned}$$

We now treat $\mathcal{E}_N^{h,k,1}$ with similar arguments. Thanks to (45), applying Lemma 4.4 gives, for $\kappa \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E}|\tilde{\zeta}_n^{h,k,1}|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} &\leq C\Delta t \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} (\mathbb{E}|\Pi_{n-1:\ell+1}S_{\Delta t}G''(X_\ell).(\eta_\ell^h, \eta_\ell^k)|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C_\kappa\Delta t \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} t_{n-\ell}^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}(\mathbb{E}|F_1''(X_\ell).(\eta_\ell^h, \eta_\ell^k)|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + C_\kappa\Delta t \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} t_{n-\ell}^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}(\mathbb{E}|(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}BF_2''(X_\ell).(\eta_\ell^h, \eta_\ell^k)|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall from (43) that $\eta_\ell^h = \Pi_{\ell-1:0}h$. Property 2.2 then gives

$$(\mathbb{E}|F_1''(X_\ell).(\eta_\ell^h, \eta_\ell^k)|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C\mathbb{1}_{\ell \neq 0}t_\ell^{-\beta-\gamma}|(-A)^{-\beta}h|_{L^{2q}}|(-A)^{-\gamma}k|_{L^{2q}} + C\mathbb{1}_{\ell=0}|h|_{L^{2q}}|k|_{L^{2q}}.$$

The remaining term is treated similarly to the one in $\mathcal{D}_N^{h,1}$. Using successively (13), (11), (8), and (9):

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E}|(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}BF_2''(X_\ell).(\eta_\ell^h, \eta_\ell^k)|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} &\leq C(\mathbb{E}|(-A)^{2\kappa}F_2''(X_\ell).(\eta_\ell^h, \eta_\ell^k)|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C\mathbb{E}(|(-A)^{3\kappa}F_2''(X_\ell)|_{L^{2q}}^2|(-A)^{4\kappa}\eta_\ell^h|_{L^{4q}}^2|(-A)^{4\kappa}\eta_\ell^k|_{L^{4q}}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C(1 + \mathbb{E}|(-A)^{4\kappa}X_\ell|_{L^{2q}}^6)^{\frac{1}{6}}\left(\mathbb{E}|(-A)^{4\kappa}\eta_\ell^h|_{L^{4q}}^6\right)^{\frac{1}{6}}\left(\mathbb{E}|(-A)^{4\kappa}\eta_\ell^k|_{L^{4q}}^6\right)^{\frac{1}{6}} \\ &\leq C\mathbb{1}_{\ell \neq 0}t_\ell^{-12\kappa-\beta-\gamma}(1 + |x|_{L^{2q}})|(-A)^{-\beta}h|_{L^{4q}}|(-A)^{-\gamma}k|_{L^{4q}} \\ &\quad + C\mathbb{1}_{\ell=0}(1 + |(-A)^{4\kappa}x|_{L^{2q}})|(-A)^{4\kappa}h|_{L^{4q}}|(-A)^{4\kappa}k|_{L^{4q}}, \end{aligned}$$

thanks to Lemma 4.4, for $\kappa > 0$ chosen sufficiently small to have $4\kappa < \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{8q}$.

We thus obtain, if $\beta + \gamma + 12\kappa < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E}|\tilde{\zeta}_N^{h,k,1}|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} &\leq C\Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}|h|_{L^{2q}}|k|_{L^{2q}} + C\Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}(1 + |(-A)^{4\kappa}x|_{L^{2q}})|(-A)^{4\kappa}h|_{L^{4q}}|(-A)^{4\kappa}k|_{L^{4q}} \\ &\quad + Ct_N^{\frac{1}{2}-11\kappa-\beta-\gamma}(1 + |x|_{L^{2q}})|(-A)^{-\beta}h|_{L^{4q}}|(-A)^{-\gamma}k|_{L^{4q}} \\ &\leq C\Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}(1 + |(-A)^{4\kappa}x|_{L^{2q}})|(-A)^{4\kappa}h|_{L^{4q}}|(-A)^{4\kappa}k|_{L^{4q}} \\ &\quad + Ct_N^{\frac{1}{2}-11\kappa-\beta-\gamma}(1 + |x|_{L^{2q}})|(-A)^{-\beta}h|_{L^{4q}}|(-A)^{-\gamma}k|_{L^{4q}}. \end{aligned}$$

and we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{E}_N^{h,k,1}| &\leq C(1 + |x|_{L^p})^K \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} (1 + |(-A)^{4\kappa} x|_{L^{2q}}) |(-A)^{4\kappa} h|_{L^{4q}} |(-A)^{4\kappa} k|_{L^{4q}} \\ &\quad + C t_N^{\frac{1}{2}-11\kappa-\beta-\gamma} (1 + |x|_{L^p})^K (1 + |x|_{L^{2q}}) |(-A)^{-\beta} h|_{L^{4q}} |(-A)^{-\gamma} k|_{L^{4q}}. \end{aligned}$$

4.5.2. *Treatment of $\mathcal{D}_N^{h,2}$ and of $\mathcal{E}_N^{h,k,2}$.* We use the following basic identities:

$$\begin{aligned} (\sigma'(X_\ell).S_{\Delta t}^\ell h)e_i &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}^*} \langle (\sigma'(X_\ell).S_{\Delta t}^\ell h)e_i, e_j \rangle e_j = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}^*} \langle (\sigma'(X_\ell).S_{\Delta t}^\ell h)e_j, e_i \rangle e_j \\ (51) \quad (\sigma''(X_\ell).(\eta_\ell^h, \eta_\ell^k))e_i &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}^*} \langle (\sigma''(X_\ell).(\eta_\ell^h, \eta_\ell^k))e_i, e_j \rangle e_j = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}^*} \langle (\sigma''(X_\ell).(\eta_\ell^h, \eta_\ell^k))e_j, e_i \rangle e_j, \end{aligned}$$

thanks to (18), from Property 2.4.

The parameter $\tau > 0$ plays an important role in the estimates below, to ensure summability with respect to $j \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Indeed, since Lemmas 4.4 and 4.6 are restricted to powers of $-A$ strictly less than $\frac{1}{2}$, the computations below for $\tau = 0$ would only provide upper bounds in terms of $\sum_j \lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} = +\infty$.

Control of $\mathcal{D}_{N,\ell}^{h,2,1}$. From (46), (51), and Assumption 2.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{D}_{N,\ell}^{h,2,1}| &= \left| \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}^*} \mathbb{E} \int_{\ell\Delta t}^{(\ell+1)\Delta t} D^2\varphi(X_N).(\mathcal{D}_s X_N(\sigma'(X_\ell).S_{\Delta t}^\ell h)e_j, \Pi_{N-1:\ell+1} e^{\tau A} S_{\Delta t} e_j) ds \right| \\ &\leq C(1 + |x|_{L^p})^K \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}^*} \int_{\ell\Delta t}^{(\ell+1)\Delta t} (\mathbb{E} |\Pi_{N-1:\ell+1} e^{\tau A} S_{\Delta t} e_j|_{L^q}^2 \mathbb{E} |\mathcal{D}_s X_N(\sigma'(X_\ell).S_{\Delta t}^\ell h)e_j|_{L^q}^2)^\frac{1}{2} ds. \end{aligned}$$

On the one hand, by Lemma 4.4, for $\ell \in \{0, \dots, N-2\}$,

$$(\mathbb{E} |\Pi_{N-1:\ell+1} e^{\tau A} S_{\Delta t} e_j|_{L^q}^2)^\frac{1}{2} \leq C t_{N-\ell-1}^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} e^{\tau A} S_{\Delta t} e_j|_{L^q} \leq C t_{N-\ell-1}^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} \tau^{-2\kappa} \lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}.$$

When $\ell = N-1$, $(\mathbb{E} |\Pi_{N-1:\ell+1} e^{\tau A} S_{\Delta t} e_j|_{L^q}^2)^\frac{1}{2} = |e^{\tau A} S_{\Delta t} e_j|_{L^q} \leq C \Delta t^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa} \lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$.

On the other hand, using Lemmas 4.5 and 4.4, and then Properties 2.1 and 2.4,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E} |\mathcal{D}_s X_N(\sigma'(X_\ell).S_{\Delta t}^\ell h)e_j|_{L^q}^2)^\frac{1}{2} &= (\mathbb{E} |\Pi_{N-1:\ell+1} S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} \sigma(X_\ell)(\sigma'(X_\ell).S_{\Delta t}^\ell h)e_j|_{L^q}^2)^\frac{1}{2} \\ &\leq C (\mathbb{E} |\sigma(X_\ell)(\sigma'(X_\ell).S_{\Delta t}^\ell h)e_j|_{L^q}^2)^\frac{1}{2} \\ &\leq C |S_{\Delta t}^\ell h|_{L^q} \\ &\leq C \mathbf{1}_{\ell \neq 0} t_\ell^{-\beta} |(-A)^{-\beta} h|_{L^q} + C \mathbf{1}_{\ell=0} |h|_{L^q}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}^*} \lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa} < \infty$ by Property 2.1. This yields

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} |\mathcal{D}_{N,\ell}^{h,2,1}| \leq \frac{C(1 + |x|_{L^p})^K}{\tau^{2\kappa}} (t_{N-1}^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} \Delta t |h|_{L^q} + t_{N-1}^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa-\beta} |(-A)^{-\beta} h|_{L^q}).$$

Control of $\mathcal{D}_{N,\ell}^{h,2,2}$. Thanks to (46), (51), and Assumption 2.5, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{D}_{N,\ell}^{h,2,2}| &= \left| \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}^*} \mathbb{E} \int_{\ell\Delta t}^{(\ell+1)\Delta t} \langle D\varphi(X_N), \mathcal{D}_s^{(\sigma'(X_\ell).S_{\Delta t}^\ell h)e_j} \Pi_{N-1:\ell+1} e^{\tau A} S_{\Delta t} e_j \rangle ds \right| \\ &\leq C(1 + |x|_{L^p})^K \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}^*} \int_{\ell\Delta t}^{(\ell+1)\Delta t} (\mathbb{E} |\mathcal{D}_s^{(\sigma'(X_\ell).S_{\Delta t}^\ell h)e_j} \Pi_{N-1:\ell+1} e^{\tau A} S_{\Delta t} e_j|_{L^q}^2)^\frac{1}{2} ds. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, observe that $\mathcal{D}_{N,N-1}^{h,2,2} = 0$, thanks to the second part of Lemma 4.6. Applying the estimate in Lemma 4.6, for $\ell \in \{0, \dots, N-2\}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\mathbb{E} |\mathcal{D}_s^{(\sigma'(X_\ell) \cdot S_{\Delta t}^\ell h) e_j} \Pi_{N-1:\ell+1} e^{\tau A} S_{\Delta t} e_j|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq C (\mathbb{E} |(\sigma'(X_\ell) \cdot S_{\Delta t}^\ell h) e_j|_{L^{2q}}|^4)^{\frac{1}{4}} \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}} |S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} e_j|_{L^{2q}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t_{N-\ell-1}^{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2q} + \kappa}}\right) \\
& \quad + C (\mathbb{E} |(\sigma'(X_\ell) \cdot S_{\Delta t}^\ell h) e_j|_{L^{2q}}|^4)^{\frac{1}{4}} \mathbb{1}_{\ell < N-2} |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2} + \kappa} S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} e_j|_{L^{2q}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t_{N-\ell-2}^{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2q} + \kappa}}\right) \\
& \leq C \left(\mathbb{1}_{\ell \neq 0} t_\ell^{-\beta} |(-A)^{-\beta} h|_{L^{2q}} + \mathbb{1}_{\ell=0} |h|_{L^{2q}} \right) \tau^{-2\kappa} \lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{2} - \kappa} \left(1 + \frac{\Delta t^\kappa}{t_{N-\ell-1}^{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2q} + \kappa}} + \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\ell < N-2}}{t_{N-\ell-2}^{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2q} + \kappa}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

This yields

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} |\mathcal{D}_{N,\ell}^{h,2,2}| \leq \frac{C(1 + |x|_{L^p})^K}{\tau^{2\kappa}} \left(1 + t_{N-1}^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2q} - \kappa - \beta}\right) \left(|(-A)^{-\beta} h|_{L^{2q}} + \frac{\Delta t}{t_{N-1}} |h|_{L^{2q}}\right).$$

Control of $\mathcal{E}_{N,\ell}^{h,k,2,1}$. Thanks to (47) and Assumption 2.5 we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{E}_{N,\ell}^{h,k,2,1}| &= \left| \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}^*} \mathbb{E} \int_{\ell \Delta t}^{(\ell+1)\Delta t} D^2 \varphi(X_N) \cdot (\mathcal{D}_s X_N (\sigma''(X_\ell) \cdot (\eta_\ell^h, \eta_\ell^k)) e_j, \Pi_{N-1:\ell+1} e^{\tau A} S_{\Delta t} e_j) ds \right| \\
&\leq C(1 + |x|_{L^p})^K \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}^*} \int_{\ell \Delta t}^{(\ell+1)\Delta t} (\mathbb{E} |\Pi_{N-1:\ell+1} e^{\tau A} S_{\Delta t} e_j|_{L^q}^2 \mathbb{E} |\mathcal{D}_s X_N (\sigma''(X_\ell) \cdot (\eta_\ell^h, \eta_\ell^k)) e_j|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} ds.
\end{aligned}$$

On the one hand, by Lemma 4.4, for $\ell \in \{0, \dots, N-2\}$,

$$(\mathbb{E} |\Pi_{N-1:\ell+1} e^{\tau A} S_{\Delta t} e_j|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C t_{N-\ell-1}^{-\frac{1}{2} + \kappa} \tau^{-2\kappa} \lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{2} - \kappa}.$$

When $\ell = N-1$, $(\mathbb{E} |\Pi_{N-1:\ell+1} e^{\tau A} S_{\Delta t} e_j|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} = |e^{\tau A} S_{\Delta t} e_j|_{L^q} \leq C \Delta t^{-\frac{1}{2} - \kappa} \lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{2} - \kappa}$.

On the other hand, using Lemmas 4.5 and 4.4, and Property 2.4,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbb{E} |\mathcal{D}_s X_N (\sigma''(X_\ell) \cdot (\eta_\ell^h, \eta_\ell^k)) e_j|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} &= (\mathbb{E} |\Pi_{N-1:\ell+1} S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} \sigma(X_\ell) (\sigma''(X_\ell) \cdot (\eta_\ell^h, \eta_\ell^k)) e_j|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C (\mathbb{E} |\sigma(X_\ell) (\sigma''(X_\ell) \cdot (\eta_\ell^h, \eta_\ell^k)) e_j|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C (\mathbb{E} |\eta_\ell^h|_{L^{2q}}^4)^{\frac{1}{4}} (\mathbb{E} |\eta_\ell^k|_{L^{2q}}^4)^{\frac{1}{4}} \\
&\leq C \mathbb{1}_{\ell \neq 0} t_\ell^{-\beta - \gamma} |(-A)^{-\beta} h|_{L^{2q}} |(-A)^{-\gamma} k|_{L^{2q}} + C \mathbb{1}_{\ell=0} |h|_{L^{2q}} |k|_{L^{2q}}.
\end{aligned}$$

This yields

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} |\mathcal{E}_{N,\ell}^{h,k,2,1}| \leq \frac{C(1 + |x|_{L^p})^K}{\tau^{2\kappa}} \left(t_{N-1}^{-\frac{1}{2} + \kappa} \Delta t |h|_{L^{2q}} |k|_{L^{2q}} + t_{N-1}^{\frac{1}{2} + \kappa - \beta - \gamma} |(-A)^{-\beta} h|_{L^{2q}} |(-A)^{-\gamma} k|_{L^{2q}} \right).$$

Control of $\mathcal{E}_{N,\ell}^{h,k,2,2}$. Thanks to (47), (51) and Assumption 2.5 we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{E}_{N,\ell}^{h,k,2,2}| &= \left| \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}^*} \mathbb{E} \int_{\ell \Delta t}^{(\ell+1)\Delta t} \langle D \varphi(X_N), \mathcal{D}_s^{(\sigma''(X_\ell) \cdot (\eta_\ell^h, \eta_\ell^k)) e_j} \Pi_{N-1:\ell+1} e^{\tau A} S_{\Delta t} e_j \rangle ds \right| \\
&\leq C(1 + |x|_{L^p})^K \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}^*} \int_{\ell \Delta t}^{(\ell+1)\Delta t} (\mathbb{E} |\mathcal{D}_s^{(\sigma''(X_\ell) \cdot (\eta_\ell^h, \eta_\ell^k)) e_j} \Pi_{N-1:\ell+1} e^{\tau A} S_{\Delta t} e_j|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} ds.
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, observe that $\mathcal{E}_{N,N-1}^{h,2,2} = 0$, thanks to the second part of Lemma 4.6. Applying the estimate in Lemma 4.6, for $\ell \in \{1, \dots, N-2\}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\mathbb{E} |\mathcal{D}_s^{(\sigma''(X_\ell) \cdot (\eta_\ell^h, \eta_\ell^k)) e_j} \Pi_{N-1:\ell+1} e^{\tau A} S_{\Delta t} e_j|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq C (\mathbb{E} |(\sigma''(X_\ell) \cdot (\eta_\ell^h, \eta_\ell^k)) e_j|_{L^{2q}}^4)^{\frac{1}{4}} \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}} |S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} e_j|_{L^{2q}} (1 + \frac{1}{t_{N-\ell-1}^{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2q} + \kappa}}) \\
& \quad + C (\mathbb{E} |(\sigma''(X_\ell) \cdot (\eta_\ell^h, \eta_\ell^k)) e_j|_{L^{2q}}^4)^{\frac{1}{4}} \mathbb{1}_{\ell < N-2} |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2} + \kappa} S_{\Delta t} e^{\tau A} e_j|_{L^{2q}} (1 + \frac{1}{t_{N-\ell-2}^{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2q} + \kappa}}) \\
& \leq C (\mathbb{E} |\eta_\ell^h|_{L^{2q}}^8)^{\frac{1}{8}} (\mathbb{E} |\eta_\ell^k|_{L^{2q}}^8)^{\frac{1}{8}} \tau^{-2\kappa} \lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{2} - \kappa} (1 + \frac{\Delta t^\kappa}{t_{N-\ell-1}^{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2q} + \kappa}} + \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\ell < N-2}}{t_{N-\ell-2}^{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2q} + \kappa}}) \\
& \leq C (\mathbb{1}_{\ell \neq 0} t_\ell^{-\beta - \gamma} |(-A)^{-\beta} h|_{L^{2q}} |(-A)^{-\gamma} k|_{L^{2q}} + \mathbb{1}_{\ell=0} |h|_{L^{2q}} |k|_{L^{2q}}) \tau^{-2\kappa} \lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{2} - \kappa} (1 + \frac{\Delta t^\kappa}{t_{N-\ell-1}^{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2q} + \kappa}} + \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\ell < N-2}}{t_{N-\ell-2}^{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2q} + \kappa}})
\end{aligned}$$

This yields

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} |\mathcal{E}_{N,\ell}^{h,k,2,2}| \leq \frac{C(1 + |x|_{L^p})^K}{\tau^{2\kappa}} (1 + t_{N-1}^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2q} - \kappa - \beta - \gamma}) \left(|(-A)^{-\beta} h|_{L^{2q}} |(-A)^{-\gamma} k|_{L^{2q}} + \frac{\Delta t}{t_N} |h|_{L^{2q}} |k|_{L^{2q}} \right).$$

4.5.3. *Estimate with $\tau > 0$.* Gathering all above estimates, we have - recall that $t_N = T$ - for $\beta \in [0, 1)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
|Du^{\delta, \tau, \Delta t}(T, x) \cdot h| &= |\mathcal{D}_N^{h,0} + \mathcal{D}_N^{h,1} + \mathcal{D}_N^{h,2}| \\
&\leq CT^{-\beta} (1 + |x|_{L^p})^K |(-A)^{-\beta} h|_{L^q} \\
&\quad + C\Delta t^{\frac{1}{2} + \kappa} (1 + |x|_{L^p})^K (1 + |(-A)^{4\kappa} x|_{L^{2q}}) |(-A)^{3\kappa} h|_{L^{2q}} \\
&\quad + CT^{\frac{1}{2} - 6\kappa - \beta} (1 + |x|_{L^p})^K (1 + |x|_{L^{2q}}) |(-A)^{-\beta} h|_{L^{2q}} \\
&\quad + \frac{C(1 + |x|_{L^p})^K}{\tau^{2\kappa}} (T^{-\frac{1}{2} + \kappa} \Delta t |h|_{L^q} + t_{N-1}^{\frac{1}{2} + \kappa - \beta} |(-A)^{-\beta} h|_{L^q}) \\
&\quad + \frac{C(1 + |x|_{L^p})^K}{\tau^{2\kappa}} (1 + T^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2q} - \kappa - \beta}) (|(-A)^{-\beta} h|_{L^{2q}} + \frac{\Delta t}{T} |h|_{L^{2q}}).
\end{aligned}$$

Define the auxiliary function $u^{\delta, \tau}$ by

$$(52) \quad u^{\delta, \tau}(t, x) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi_\delta(X^{\delta, \tau}(t, x))],$$

where

$$(53) \quad dX_t^\delta = AX_t^\delta dt + G_\delta(X_t^\delta) dt + e^{\tau A} \sigma_\delta(X_t^\delta) dW(t), \quad X^{\delta, \tau}(0) = x.$$

Letting $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$, we obtain Proposition 4.10.

Proposition 4.10. *For every $\beta \in [0, 1)$ and $\kappa \in (0, 1)$, there exists $C_{\beta, \kappa}(T)$, such that for every $\delta, \tau \in (0, 1)$, $x \in L^p$ and $h \in L^{2q}$*

$$(54) \quad |Du^{\delta, \tau}(T, x) \cdot h| \leq \frac{C_{\beta, \kappa}(T)}{\tau^\kappa T^\beta} (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}}^{K+1}) |(-A)^{-\beta} h|_{L^{2q}}.$$

Gathering estimates concerning the second-order derivative, with $D^2 u^{\delta, \tau, \Delta t}(T, x) \cdot (h, k) = \mathcal{E}_N^{h, k, 0} + \mathcal{E}_N^{h, k, 1} + \mathcal{E}_N^{h, k, 2}$, and letting $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$, we also obtain Proposition 4.11.

Proposition 4.11. *For every $\beta, \gamma \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $\kappa \in (0, 1)$, there exists $C_{\beta, \gamma, \kappa}(T)$ such that for every $\delta, \tau \in (0, 1)$, $x \in L^p$ and $h, k \in L^{4q}$*

$$(55) \quad |D^2 u^{\delta, \tau}(T, x) \cdot (h, k)| \leq \frac{C_{\beta, \gamma, \kappa}(T)}{\tau^\kappa T^{\beta + \gamma}} (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}}^{K+1}) |(-A)^{-\beta} h|_{L^{4q}} |(-A)^{-\gamma} k|_{L^{4q}}.$$

4.5.4. *Conclusion.* To get rid of the singular factor $\tau^{-\kappa}$ in the estimates (54) and (55) above, we use an interpolation argument. We need the following result, which is not optimal – we expect an order $\frac{1}{4}$ in (58) as in (56) – but sufficient for our purpose.

Proposition 4.12. *For every $\kappa \in (0, 1)$, $T > 0$, there exists $C_{\kappa, \epsilon}(T) \in (0, \infty)$, such that for every $\delta, \tau \in (0, 1)$, $x \in L^p$ and $h, k \in L^{2q}$*

$$(56) \quad |u^{\delta, \tau}(T, x) - u_\delta(T, x)| \leq C_\kappa(T) \tau^{\frac{1}{4} - \kappa} (1 + |x|_{L^p}^K)$$

$$(57) \quad |(Du^{\delta, \tau}(T, x) - Du_\delta(T, x)) \cdot h| \leq C_\kappa(T) \tau^{\frac{1}{4} - \kappa} (1 + |x|_{L^p}^K) |h_1|_{L^q}$$

$$(58) \quad |(D^2 u^{\delta, \tau}(T, x) - D^2 u_\delta(T, x)) \cdot (h, k)| \leq C_\kappa(T) \tau^{\frac{1}{8} - \kappa} (1 + |x|_{L^p}^K) |h|_{L^{3q}} |k|_{L^{3q}}.$$

Proof of Proposition 4.12. Again, we omit to write the dependance on δ , for instance we write u^τ and u instead of $u^{\delta, \tau}$ and u_δ . Also, we only treat the case $q > 2$. For every $\tau \in [0, 1]$, let $(X_t^\tau)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ denote the solution of

$$dX_t^\tau = AX_t^\tau dt + G(X_t^\tau) dt + e^{\tau A} \sigma(X_t^\tau) dW(t), \quad X_0^\tau = x,$$

so that $u^\tau(T, x) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_T^\tau)]$, $X^0 = X$ and $u^0 = u$.

We first prove (56). Due to the regularity conditions on the test functions φ , see Assumption 2.5, it is sufficient to prove the following bounds: for every $M \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and every $p, q \in [2, \infty)$, for every $\gamma \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $\kappa > 0$ sufficiently small, there exists $C_{M, p, q}(T) \in (0, \infty)$, such that for every $0 < t \leq T$ and every $x \in L^p$, we have

$$(59) \quad \begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E}|X^\tau(t)|_{L^p}^{2M})^{\frac{1}{2M}} &\leq C_{\gamma, \kappa, p, q, M}(T) (1 + |x|_{L^p}), \\ (\mathbb{E}|X^\tau(t) - X^0(t)|_{L^p}^{2M})^{\frac{1}{2M}} &\leq C_{\gamma, \kappa, p, q, M}(T) \tau^{\frac{1}{4} - \kappa} \end{aligned}$$

For simplicity, we treat only the case $M = 1$. The first inequality is easy because F_1 , F_2 , and σ are bounded.

Since $(e^{tA})_{t \geq 0}$ is an analytic semi-group on L^p for every $p \in [2, \infty)$, it is standard that for $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, there exists $C(p, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$(60) \quad |(-A)^{-\alpha} (e^{\tau A} - I)|_{\mathcal{L}(L^p, L^p)} \leq C(p, \alpha) \tau^\alpha.$$

Let us write $e_\tau = X^\tau - X^0$, $e_\tau = e_\tau^1 + e_\tau^2$ with

$$\begin{aligned} e_\tau^1 &= \int_0^\tau e^{(\tau-s)A} (F_1(X_s^\tau) - F_1(X_s^0)) ds + \left(\int_0^\tau e^{(\tau-s+\tau)A} (\sigma(X_s^\tau) - \sigma(X_s^0)) dW(s) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_0^\tau (e^{\tau A} - I) e^{(\tau-s)A} \sigma(X_s^0) dW(s), \right) \end{aligned}$$

which yields, thanks to Properties 2.2 and 2.4,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|e_\tau^1(t)|_{L^q}^2 &\leq C \int_0^\tau \mathbb{E}|X_s^\tau - X_s^0|_{L^q}^2 ds \\ &\quad + C \int_0^\tau |(-A)^{\frac{1}{2q}} e^{(\tau-s+\tau)A}|_{R(L^2, L^q)}^2 \mathbb{E}|X_s^\tau - X_s^0|_{L^q}^2 ds \\ &\quad + C \int_0^\tau |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{4} + \kappa} (e^{\tau A} - I)|_{\mathcal{L}(L^q, L^q)}^2 |(-A)^{\frac{1}{4} - \kappa} e^{(\tau-s+\tau)A}|_{R(L^2, L^q)}^2 ds \\ &\leq C \int_0^\tau \left(\frac{1}{(t-s)^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{q} + \kappa}} + 1 \right) \mathbb{E}|X_s^\tau - X_s^0|_{L^q}^2 ds + C \tau^{\frac{1}{2} - 2\kappa}, \end{aligned}$$

using a continuous time version of Lemma 4.3.

The equation for e^2 is

$$\frac{d}{dt} e_\tau^2 = A e_\tau^2 + (B F_2(X^\tau) - B F_2(X^0)), \quad e_\tau^2(0) = 0.$$

We estimate e_τ^2 by an energy method. Recall that we work in fact with regularized coefficients, $G_\delta = B e^{\delta A} F_2(e^\delta \cdot) + e^{\delta A} F_1(e^\delta \cdot)$, so that both X^τ and X are sufficiently regular to justify all the computations.

Multiply the equation by $(e_\tau^2)^{q-1}$, integrate in space to get thanks to standard manipulations as in the proof of Lemma 4.7:

$$\frac{d}{dt}|e_\tau^2|_{L^q}^q \leq c|X^\tau - X_0|_{L^q}^2 |e_\tau^2|_{L^q}^{q-2}$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dt}|e_\tau^2|_{L^q}^2 \leq c|X^\tau - X_0|_{L^q}^2.$$

Integrating in time and adding with the inequality above yields:

$$\mathbb{E}|X_t^\tau - X_t^0|_{L^q}^2 \leq C \int_0^t \left(\frac{1}{(t-s)^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{q} + \kappa}} + 1 \right) \mathbb{E}|X_s^\tau - X_s^0|_{L^q}^2 ds + C\tau^{\frac{1}{2} - 2\kappa}$$

and (56) follows from Gronwall Lemma.

The proof of (57) is similar but longer; details are left to the reader. Finally, instead of proving (58) with similar long but straightforward arguments (and a better estimate with $\tau^{\frac{1}{4} - \kappa}$ is obtained), it is simpler to use Proposition 3.5 for $k_1, k_2, k_3 \in L^{3q}$:

$$|D^3 u_\delta(T, x) \cdot (k_1, k_2, k_3)| \leq C_\beta(T)(1 + |x|_{L^p})^K |k_1|_{L^{3q}} |k_2|_{L^{3q}} |k_3|_{L^{3q}}.$$

and get the result by an interpolation argument. \square

We are now in position to conclude the proof of Theorem 3.2. Identifying the first order derivative with the gradient, and letting $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{2q} = 1$, we may rewrite (54) and (57) as

$$\begin{aligned} |(-A)^\beta Du^{\delta, \tau}(T, x)|_{L^r} &\leq \frac{C_{\beta, \kappa}(T)}{\tau^\kappa T^\beta} (1 + |x|_{L^p})^K (1 + |x|_{L^{2q}}), \\ |Du^{\delta, \tau}(T, x) - Du_\delta(T, x)|_{L^r} &\leq C_\kappa(T) \tau^{\frac{1}{4} - \kappa} (1 + |x|_{L^p})^K. \end{aligned}$$

for $\beta \in [0, 1)$. Take $\tau_k = 2^{-k}$, $0 < \beta < \tilde{\beta} < 1$, $\lambda = \frac{\beta}{\tilde{\beta}}$ and $\kappa < \frac{1}{4}(1 - \lambda)$. Then we may write:

$$\begin{aligned} |(-A)^\beta Du_\delta(T, x)|_{L^r} &\leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |(-A)^\beta (Du^{\delta, \tau_{k+1}}(T, x) - Du^{\delta, \tau_k}(T, x))|_{L^r} \\ &\leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |(-A)^{\tilde{\beta}} (Du^{\delta, \tau_{k+1}}(T, x) - Du^{\delta, \tau_k}(T, x))|_{L^r}^\lambda |Du^{\delta, \tau_{k+1}}(T, x) - Du^{\delta, \tau_k}(T, x)|_{L^r}^{1-\lambda} \\ &\leq \frac{C_{\beta, \kappa}(T)}{T^\beta} (1 + |x|_{L^p})^K (1 + |x|_{L^{2q}}) \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} 2^{k(-\kappa\lambda + (\frac{1}{4} - \kappa)(1 - \lambda))} \\ &\leq \frac{C_{\beta, \kappa}(T)}{T^\beta} (1 + |x|_{L^p})^K (1 + |x|_{L^{2q}}). \end{aligned}$$

This yields (25), and concludes the proof of Theorem 3.2.

We proceed similarly for the proof of Theorem 3.3, and thus we will not provide all details. Identifying the second order derivative with the Hessian, and letting $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{4q} = 1$, we may rewrite (55) and (58) as

$$\begin{aligned} |(-A)^\gamma D^2 u^{\delta, \tau}(T, x) (-A)^\beta h|_{L^r} &\leq \frac{C_{\beta, \gamma, \kappa}(T)}{\tau^\kappa T^{\beta + \gamma}} (1 + |x|_{L^p}^K) (1 + |x|_{L^{2q}}) |h|_{L^{4q}} \\ |(D^2 u^{\delta, \tau}(T, x) - D^2 u_\delta(T, x)) h|_{L^r} &\leq C_{\kappa, \epsilon}(T) \tau^{\frac{1}{8} - \kappa} (1 + |x|_{L^p}^K) |h|_{L^{4q}}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us first take $\beta = 0$ and take $\gamma < \tilde{\gamma} < \frac{1}{2}$, $\lambda = \frac{\gamma}{\tilde{\gamma}}$ and $\kappa < \frac{1}{8}(1 - \lambda)$; then, for $\tau_1 \leq \tau_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} |(-A)^\gamma (D^2 u^{\delta_1, \tau}(T, x) - D^2 u^{\delta_2, \tau}(T, x)) h|_{L^r} &\leq |(-A)^{\tilde{\gamma}} (D^2 u^{\delta_1, \tau}(T, x) - D^2 u^{\delta_2, \tau}(T, x)) h|_{L^r}^\lambda |D^2 u^{\delta_1, \tau}(T, x) - D^2 u^{\delta_2, \tau}(T, x)|_{L^r}^{1-\lambda} \\ &\leq \frac{C_{\gamma, \kappa}(T)}{T^\gamma} \tau_2^{\frac{1}{8}(1 - \lambda) - \kappa} (1 + |x|_{L^p})^K (1 + |x|_{L^{2q}}) |h|_{L^{4q}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $D^2 u$ is symmetric, it follows replacing γ by $\beta \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$:

$$|(D^2 u^{\delta_1, \tau}(T, x) - D^2 u^{\delta_2, \tau}(T, x)) (-A)^\beta h|_{L^r} \leq \frac{C_{\beta, \alpha_0}(T)}{T^\beta} \tau_2^{\alpha_0} (1 + |x|_{L^p})^K (1 + |x|_{L^{2q}}) |h|_{L^{4q}},$$

for $\alpha_0 < \frac{1}{8}(1 - \beta)$. We then repeat the argument to conclude the proof of Theorem 3.3.

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.6

Recall the definition of the scheme, see (28): for $n \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$,

$$(61) \quad X_{n+1} = S_{\Delta t} X_n + \Delta t S_{\Delta t} G(X_n) + S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_n) \Delta W_n,$$

with the initial condition $X_0 = x$, the condition $N\Delta t = T$, and the Wiener increments $\Delta W_n = W((n+1)\Delta t) - W(n\Delta t)$. Recall the notation $S_{\Delta t} = (I - \Delta t A)^{-1}$.

Let φ be a function satisfying Assumption 2.5, and $u(t, x) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_t(x))]$ be defined by (24).

In order to justify all computations below, it is convenient to replace G and σ in (61) with the regularized coefficients G_δ and σ_δ introduced in Section 3, and to consider u_δ defined by (23) instead of u . Since all upper bounds hold true uniformly with respect to δ , passing to the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$ allows us to remove this regularization parameter. To simplify the notation, we do not mention δ in the computations.

Associated with the scheme (61), we introduce an auxiliary, continuous-time, process $(\tilde{X}(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$, defined on each interval $[t_n, t_{n+1}]$ by

$$(62) \quad \tilde{X}(t) = X_n + (t - t_n) S_{\Delta t} A X_n + (t - t_n) S_{\Delta t} G(X_n) + S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_n) (W(t) - W(t_n)).$$

Equivalently, $\tilde{X}(t_n) = X_n$, and for $t \in [t_n, t_{n+1}]$,

$$(63) \quad d\tilde{X}(t) = S_{\Delta t} A X_n dt + S_{\Delta t} G(X_n) dt + S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_n) dW(t).$$

Note that Lemma 4.1 is still true for $\delta = \tau = 0$ so that we have bounds on the moments of X_n in $D((-A)^\alpha)$, $\alpha < \frac{1}{4}$. Moreover

$$(64) \quad |(-A)^\alpha \tilde{X}(t)|_{L^p} \leq c |(-A)^\alpha X_n|_{L^p}, \quad t \in [t_n, t_{n+1}].$$

Using the notation $\ell_s = \ell$ if $s \in [t_\ell, t_{\ell+1})$, for $s \in [0, T]$, we have the formulation

$$(65) \quad X_k = S_{\Delta t}^k x + \Delta t \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell} G(X_\ell) + \int_0^{t_k} S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_s} \sigma(X_{\ell_s}) dW(s).$$

Following the standard approach, introduced first in the SDE setting, see [42] and the monographs [27] and [32], the weak error (29) is decomposed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\varphi(X(T)) - \mathbb{E}\varphi(X_N) &= \mathbb{E}[u(T, x) - u(0, X_N)] \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \mathbb{E}[u(T - t_k, X_k) - u(T - t_{k+1}, X_{k+1})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[u(T - \Delta t, X_1) - u(T, x)] + \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} (a_k + b_k + c_k), \end{aligned}$$

with

$$(66) \quad \begin{aligned} a_k &= \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E}\langle A\tilde{X}(t) - AS_{\Delta t}X_k, Du(T - t, \tilde{X}(t)) \rangle dt, \\ b_k &= \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E}\langle G(\tilde{X}(t)) - S_{\Delta t}G(X_k), Du(T - t, \tilde{X}(t)) \rangle dt, \\ c_k &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E}\text{Tr}\left([\sigma(\tilde{X}(t))^2 - S_{\Delta t}\sigma(X_k)^2 S_{\Delta t}] D^2 u(T - t, \tilde{X}(t))\right) dt, \end{aligned}$$

where in c_k we have used the property $\sigma(\cdot)^* = \sigma(\cdot)$, see (18), Property 2.4.

In the following sections, we successively treat the terms $\mathbb{E}[u(T - \Delta t, X_1) - u(T, x)]$, a_k , b_k and c_k . A technical result is given in Section 5.5.

We will control the error terms, in terms of $\Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$ with positive, arbitrarily small κ . We do not try to obtain optimal constants. The value of κ may change from line to line. At the end of the proof, gathering the estimates and choosing an appropriate κ gives the result.

5.1. **Control of $\mathbb{E}[u(T - \Delta t, X_1) - u(T, x)]$.** We note that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[u(T - \Delta t, X_1) - u(T, x)]| &\leq |\mathbb{E}[u(T - \Delta t, X_1) - u(T - \Delta t, X(\Delta t))]| \\ &\leq \frac{C}{(T - \Delta t)^{1-\kappa}} (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} (\mathbb{E}|(-A)^{-1+\kappa}(X_1 - X(\Delta t))|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

using Theorem 3.2.

We then write $X_1 - X(\Delta t) = (X_1 - x) - (X(\Delta t) - x)$, and note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|(-A)^{-1+\kappa}(X_1 - x)|_{L^q}^2 &\leq C|(-A)^{-1+\kappa}(S_{\Delta t} - I)x|_{L^q}^2 \\ &\quad + \Delta t|(-A)^{-1+\kappa}S_{\Delta t}G(x)|_{L^q}^2 + C\Delta t|(-A)^{-1+\kappa}|_{R(L^2, L^q)}^2 |S_{\Delta t}\sigma(x)|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq C\Delta t^{1-2\kappa}|x|_{L^q}^2 + C\Delta t. \end{aligned}$$

We have used the two following inequalities. First, for every $\beta \in [0, 1)$ and $q \in [2, \infty)$, there exists $C_{\beta, q}$ such that

$$(67) \quad |(-A)^{-\beta}(S_{\Delta t} - I)|_{\mathcal{L}(L^q)} = \Delta t|(-A)^{1-\beta}S_{\Delta t}|_{\mathcal{L}(L^q)} \leq C_{\beta, q}\Delta t^\beta,$$

using the identity $S_{\Delta t} - I = \Delta tAS_{\Delta t}$ and Lemma 4.2 (with $n = 1$).

Second, adapting the proof of Lemma 4.3, for $\alpha > \frac{1}{4}$,

$$|(-A)^{-\alpha}|_{R(L^2, L^q)}^2 < \infty.$$

Similarly,

$$\mathbb{E}|(-A)^{-1+\kappa}(X(\Delta t) - x)|_{L^q}^2 \leq C\Delta t^{1-2\kappa}|x|_{L^q}^2 + C\Delta t.$$

We thus obtain

$$(68) \quad |\mathbb{E}[u(T - \Delta t, X_1) - u(T, x)]| \leq C(T)(1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1}\Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}.$$

5.2. **Control of a_k .**

5.2.1. *Decompositions.* For each $k \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$, a_k is decomposed into the following terms:

$$(69) \quad a_k = a_k^1 + a_k^2 = (a_k^{1,1} + a_k^{1,2} + a_k^{1,3}) + (a_k^{2,1} + a_k^{2,2} + a_k^{2,3}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_k^1 &= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \langle A(I - S_{\Delta t})X_k, Du(T - t, \tilde{X}(t)) \rangle dt, \\ a_k^2 &= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \langle A(\tilde{X}(t) - X_k), Du(T - t, \tilde{X}(t)) \rangle dt, \end{aligned}$$

and a_k^1 and a_k^2 are further decomposed into

$$\begin{aligned} a_k^{1,1} &= -\Delta t \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \langle A^2 S_{\Delta t}^{k+1} x, Du(T - t, \tilde{X}(t)) \rangle dt, \\ a_k^{1,2} &= -\Delta t \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \langle \Delta t \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} A^2 S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell+1} G(X_\ell), Du(T - t, \tilde{X}(t)) \rangle dt, \\ a_k^{1,3} &= -\Delta t \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \langle \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} A^2 S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell+1} \sigma(X_\ell) \Delta W_\ell, Du(T - t, \tilde{X}(t)) \rangle dt, \end{aligned}$$

and, using (62),

$$\begin{aligned} a_k^{2,1} &= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} (t - t_k) \langle S_{\Delta t} A^2 X_k, Du(T - t, \tilde{X}(t)) \rangle dt, \\ a_k^{2,2} &= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} (t - t_k) \langle AS_{\Delta t} G(X_k), Du(T - t, \tilde{X}(t)) \rangle dt, \\ a_k^{2,3} &= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \langle AS_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k) (W(t) - W(t_k)), Du(T - t, \tilde{X}(t)) \rangle dt. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, $I - S_{\Delta t} = -\Delta t A S_{\Delta t}$, and

$$(70) \quad X_k = S_{\Delta t}^k x + \Delta t \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell} G(X_\ell) + \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell} \sigma(X_\ell) \Delta W_\ell.$$

5.2.2. *Treatment of $a_k^{1,1}$.* We treat successively the terms $a_k^{1,1}$, $a_k^{1,2}$ and $a_k^{1,3}$. The first quantity only needs elementary arguments and Theorem 3.2, with $\beta \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$. The second quantity requires the stronger version of Theorem 3.2, with $\beta \in [0, 1)$, contrary to [16], due to the Burgers type nonlinearity. The third quantity requires the use of Malliavin integration by parts formula, and of Theorem 3.3 with $\beta, \gamma \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$.

We also use repeatedly (64) combined with Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

Treatment of $a_k^{1,1}$. Using Theorem 3.2, with $\beta = \frac{1}{2} - \kappa$, we get for $k \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |a_k^{1,1}| &\leq C_\kappa (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \Delta t \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} A^2 S_{\Delta t}^{k+1} x|_{L^{2q}} dt \\ &\leq C_\kappa (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \Delta t \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} |(-A)^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa} S_{\Delta t} (-A)^{1-\kappa} S_{\Delta t}^k x|_{L^{2q}} dt \\ &\leq C_\kappa (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} |x|_{L^q} \frac{\Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-2\kappa}}{t_k^{1-\kappa}} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} dt, \end{aligned}$$

using Lemma 4.2.

Treatment of $a_k^{1,2}$. Similarly, thanks to (13), the boundedness of the mappings F_1 and F_2 from L^q to L^q , thanks to Property 2.2, using Theorem 3.2 with $\beta = 1 - \kappa$,

$$\begin{aligned} |a_k^{1,2}| &\leq C_\kappa (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \Delta t \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-\kappa}} \Delta t \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} |(-A)^{\frac{1}{2}+3\kappa} S_{\Delta t} (-A)^{1-\kappa} S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell}|_{\mathcal{L}(L^{2q})} dt \\ &\leq C_\kappa (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} |x|_{L^q} \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-3\kappa} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-\kappa}} dt \Delta t \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} \frac{1}{t_{k-\ell}^{1-\kappa}} \\ &\leq C_\kappa (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} |x|_{L^q} \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-3\kappa} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-\kappa}} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Treatment of $a_k^{1,3}$. Let $k \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$. For technical reasons, we decompose $a_k^{1,3} = a_k^{1,3,1} + a_k^{1,3,2}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} a_k^{1,3,1} &= -\Delta t \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left\langle \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-2} A^2 S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell+1} \sigma(X_\ell) \Delta W_\ell, Du(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \right\rangle dt \\ &= -\Delta t \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left\langle \int_0^{t_{k-1}} A^2 S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_s+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_s}) dW(s), Du(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \right\rangle dt \\ a_k^{1,3,2} &= -\Delta t \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \langle A^2 S_{\Delta t}^2 \sigma(X_{k-1}) \Delta W_{k-1}, Du(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \rangle dt, \end{aligned}$$

with the convention that $a_1^{1,3,1} = 0$.

We first treat $a_k^{1,3,1}$. Using Malliavin's integration by parts formula,

$$\begin{aligned}
a_k^{1,3,1} &= -\Delta t \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left\langle \int_0^{t_{k-1}} A^2 S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_s+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_s}) dW(s), Du(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \right\rangle dt \\
&= -\Delta t \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_0^{t_{k-1}} \text{Tr} \left(\sigma(X_{\ell_s})^* A^2 S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_s+1} D^2 u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \mathcal{D}_s \tilde{X}(t) \right) ds dt \\
&= -\Delta t \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_0^{t_{k-1}} \text{Tr} \left(\sigma(X_{\ell_s})^* A^2 S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_s+1} D^2 u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) U(t, s) S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_{\ell_s}) \right) ds dt \\
&= -\Delta t \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_0^{t_{k-1}} \sum_i D^2 u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \cdot \left(A^2 S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_s+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_s})^2 e_i, U(t, s) S_{\Delta t} e_i \right) ds dt,
\end{aligned}$$

where we use that $\sigma(x)^* = \sigma(x)$, and we have introduced the linear operator $U(t, s)$ such that $\mathcal{D}_s \tilde{X}(t) = U(t, s) S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_{\ell_s})$. We then apply Theorem 3.3.

On the one hand, using Property 2.4,

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\mathbb{E} |A^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa+2} S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_s+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_s})^2 e_i|_{L^{4q}}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq |(-A)^{1-\kappa} S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_s}|_{\mathcal{L}(L^{4q})} |(-A)^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa} S_{\Delta t}|_{\mathcal{L}(L^{4q})} (\mathbb{E} |\sigma(X_{\ell_s})^2 e_i|_{L^{4q}}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \frac{C \Delta t^{-\frac{1}{2}-2\kappa}}{t_{k-\ell_s}^{1-\kappa}} |e_i|_{L^{4q}},
\end{aligned}$$

thanks to Lemma 4.2, under the condition that $\ell_s < k-1$.

On the other hand, we use Lemma 5.1, see Section 5.5. Thanks to Theorem 3.3, we thus have

$$\begin{aligned}
|a_k^{1,3,1}| &\leq C \Delta t (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_0^{t_{k-1}} \frac{C \Delta t^{-\frac{1}{2}-2\kappa}}{(T-t)^{1-\kappa} t_{k-\ell_s}^{1-\kappa}} \sum_i (\mathbb{E} |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} U(t, s) S_{\Delta t} e_i|_{L^{4q}}^4)^{\frac{1}{4}} ds dt \\
&\leq C \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-3\kappa} (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{C}{(T-t)^{1-\kappa}} dt \left(\Delta t \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-2} \frac{1}{t_{k-\ell}^{1-\kappa}} \right) \sum_i (|(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa} S_{\Delta t} e_i|_{L^{4q}} \\
&\quad + C \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}} |S_{\Delta t} e_i|_{L^{4q}}) dt \\
&\leq C \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-5\kappa} (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{C}{(T-t)^{1-\kappa}} dt
\end{aligned}$$

Indeed, $\sum_i (|(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa} S_{\Delta t} e_i|_{L^{4q}} + C \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}} |S_{\Delta t} e_i|_{L^{4q}}) \leq C \Delta t^{-3\kappa}$.

It remains to treat $a_k^{1,3,2}$. This is done with much simpler arguments: using Theorem 3.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
|a_k^{1,3,2}| &\leq C \Delta t (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} (\Delta t \mathbb{E} |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} A^2 S_{\Delta t}^2 \sigma(X_{k-1})|_{R(L^2, L^{2q})}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} dt \\
&\leq C \Delta t (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} dt \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-1+\kappa},
\end{aligned}$$

using $|(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+3\kappa}|_{R(L^2, L^2)} < \infty$ and $|(-A)^{1-\kappa} S_{\Delta t}|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \leq C \Delta t^{-1+\kappa}$.

Conclusion. Gathering the estimates on $a_k^{1,1}$, $a_k^{1,2}$ and $a_k^{1,3}$, and summing for $k \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$, we obtain

$$(71) \quad \sum_{k=1}^N |a_k^1| \leq C \Delta^{\frac{1}{2}-5\kappa} (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_0^T \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-\kappa}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{1-\kappa}}\right) dt.$$

5.2.3. *Treatment of a_k^2 .*

Treatment of $a_k^{2,1}$. Since $AS_{\Delta t} = -\frac{1}{\Delta t}(I - S_{\Delta t})$, we rewrite

$$a_k^{2,1} = -\mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{(t - t_k)}{\Delta t} \langle A(I - S_{\Delta t})X_k, Du(T - t, \tilde{X}(t)) \rangle dt$$

and observe that the right-hand side has the same structure as a_k^1 . Using the straightforward inequality $t - t_k \leq \Delta t$ when $t_k \leq t \leq t_{k+1}$, we thus directly obtain that $\sum_{k=1}^{N-1} |a_k^{2,1}|$ is bounded from above by the right-hand side of (71).

Treatment of $a_k^{2,2}$. We again use Theorem 3.2 (with $\beta = 1 - \kappa$), inequality (13) with Proposition 2.2, and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |a_k^{2,2}| &= \left| \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} (t - t_k) \langle AS_{\Delta t} G(X_k), Du(T - t, \tilde{X}(t)) \rangle dt \right| \\ &\leq C\Delta t (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T - t)^{1-\kappa}} |(-A)^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa} S_{\Delta t} (-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa} G(X_k)|_{L^{2q}} dt \\ &\leq C\Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-2\kappa} (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T - t)^{1-\kappa}} dt, \end{aligned}$$

thanks to Lemma 4.2.

Treatment of $a_k^{2,3}$. To treat this term, we again use Malliavin's integration by parts formula. Writing the Wiener increment as a stochastic integral, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} a_k^{2,3} &= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left\langle \int_{t_k}^t AS_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k) dW(s), Du(T - t, \tilde{X}(t)) \right\rangle dt \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^t \text{Tr} \left(\sigma(X_k)^* S_{\Delta t} A D^2 u(T - t, \tilde{X}(t)) \mathcal{D}_s \tilde{X}(t) \right) ds dt \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^t \text{Tr} \left(\sigma(X_k)^* S_{\Delta t} A D^2 u(T - t, \tilde{X}(t)) S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k) \right) ds dt \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} (t - t_k) \sum_i D^2 u(T - t, \tilde{X}(t)) \cdot (S_{\Delta t} e_i, AS_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k)^2 e_i) dt, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used $\sigma(x)^* = \sigma(x)$, and the equality $\mathcal{D}_s \tilde{X}(t) = S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k)$ for $t_k \leq s < t \leq t_{k+1}$, obtained from (62). We then use Theorem 3.3 and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |a_k^{2,3}| &\leq C\Delta t (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T - t)^{1-\kappa}} dt \sum_i |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} S_{\Delta t} e_i|_{L^{4q}} |(-A)^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k)^2 e_i|_{L^{4q}} \\ &\leq C\Delta t (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T - t)^{1-\kappa}} dt \left(\Delta t^{-2\kappa} \sum_i \frac{1}{\lambda_i^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} \right) \Delta t^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}. \end{aligned}$$

Conclusion. Gathering the estimates on $a_k^{2,1}$, $a_k^{2,2}$ and $a_k^{2,3}$, and summing for $k \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$, we obtain

$$(72) \quad \sum_{k=1}^N |a_k^2| \leq C\Delta^{\frac{1}{2}-2\kappa} (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_0^T \frac{1}{(T - t)^{1-\kappa}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{1-\kappa}} \right) dt.$$

5.3. Control of b_k .

5.3.1. *Decompositions.* For each $k \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$, b_k is decomposed into the following terms:

$$(73) \quad b_k = b_k^1 + b_k^2 = b_k^1 + (b_k^{2,1} + b_k^{2,2} + b_k^{2,3} + b_k^{2,4}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} b_k^1 &= \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E} \langle (I - S_{\Delta t})G(X_k), Du(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \rangle dt, \\ b_k^2 &= \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E} \langle G(\tilde{X}(t)) - G(X_k), Du(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \rangle dt \\ &= \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E} \sum_i [G_i(\tilde{X}(t)) - G_i(X_k)] \partial_i u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) dt, \end{aligned}$$

where $G_i(\cdot) = \langle G(\cdot), e_i \rangle$ and $\partial_i u(\cdot, \cdot) = \langle Du(\cdot, \cdot), e_i \rangle$.

In addition, b_k^2 is further decomposed with

$$\begin{aligned} b_k^{2,1} &= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \sum_i \partial_i u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \text{Tr} \left(S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k)^2 S_{\Delta t} D^2 G_i(\tilde{X}(s)) \right) ds dt \\ b_k^{2,2} &= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \sum_i \partial_i u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \langle S_{\Delta t} A X_k, D G_i(\tilde{X}(s)) \rangle ds dt \\ b_k^{2,3} &= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \sum_i \partial_i u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \langle S_{\Delta t} F(X_k), D G_i(\tilde{X}(s)) \rangle ds dt \\ b_k^{2,4} &= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \sum_i \partial_i u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \int_{t_k}^t \langle D G_i(\tilde{X}(s)), S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k) dW(s) \rangle dt, \end{aligned}$$

thanks to Itô's formula, and using $\sigma(\cdot)^* = \sigma(\cdot)$.

5.3.2. *Treatment of b_k^1 .* We directly apply Theorem 3.2, with $\beta = 1 - \kappa$, and thanks to (67), Property 2.2, and inequality (13), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |b_k^1| &\leq C(1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-\kappa}} |(-A)^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa} S_{\Delta t} (-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa} G(X_k)|_{\mathcal{L}(L^q)} dt \\ &\leq C \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-2\kappa} (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-\kappa}} dt, \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N-1} |b_k^1| \leq C \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-2\kappa} (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1}.$$

5.3.3. *Treatment of b_k^2 .*

Control of $b_k^{2,1}$. To treat the term $b_k^{2,1}$, we expand the trace, using the orthonormal system $(e_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*}$, and with straightforward calculations we write

$$\begin{aligned} b_k^{2,1} &= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \sum_i \partial_i u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \text{Tr} \left(S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k)^2 S_{\Delta t} D^2 G_i(\tilde{X}(s)) \right) ds dt \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \sum_{i,n} \partial_i u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) D^2 G_i(\tilde{X}(s)) \cdot (S_{\Delta t} e_n, S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k)^2 e_n) ds dt \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \sum_n \langle Du(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)), D^2 G(\tilde{X}(s)) \cdot (S_{\Delta t} e_n, S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k)^2 e_n) \rangle ds dt \end{aligned}$$

Using Theorem 3.2, with $\beta = \frac{1}{2} + \kappa$, combined with inequality (13), and Properties 2.1 and 2.2, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|b_k^{2,1}| &\leq C(1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p,2q)}})^{K+1} \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} \\
&\quad \int_{t_k}^t \sum_{j \in \{1,2\}, n \in \mathbb{N}^*} (\mathbb{E} |D^2 F_j(\tilde{X}(s)) \cdot (S_{\Delta t} e_n, S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k)^2 e_n)|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} ds dt \\
&\leq C \Delta t (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p,2q)}})^{K+1} \sum_n |S_{\Delta t} e_n|_{L^{2q}} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} dt \\
&\leq C \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa} (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p,2q)}})^{K+1} \sum_n \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Control of $b_k^{2,2}$. As for the term $a_k^{1,3}$, we need to further decompose

$$\begin{aligned}
b_k^{2,2} &= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \langle Du(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)), DG(\tilde{X}(s)) \cdot (S_{\Delta t} A X_k) \rangle ds dt \\
&= b_k^{2,2,1} + b_k^{2,2,2} + b_k^{2,2,3},
\end{aligned}$$

where, using (70),

$$\begin{aligned}
b_k^{2,2,1} &= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \langle Du(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)), DG(\tilde{X}(s)) \cdot (S_{\Delta t}^{k+1} A x) \rangle ds dt \\
b_k^{2,2,2} &= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \langle Du(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)), DG(\tilde{X}(s)) \cdot (\Delta t \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} A S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell+1} G(X_\ell)) \rangle ds dt \\
b_k^{2,2,3} &= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \langle Du(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)), DG(\tilde{X}(s)) \cdot (\sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} A S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell+1} \sigma(X_\ell) \Delta W_\ell) \rangle ds dt.
\end{aligned}$$

The terms $b_k^{2,2,1}$ and $b_k^{2,2,2}$ are estimated using Theorem 3.2 in a straightforward way. On the one hand, thanks to (13),

$$\begin{aligned}
|b_k^{2,2,1}| &\leq C \Delta t \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} dt (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p,2q)}})^{K+1} |S_{\Delta t}^{k+1} A x|_{L^q} dt \\
&\leq C \frac{\Delta t^{1-\kappa}}{t_k^{1-\kappa}} (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p,2q)}})^{K+1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} dt.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
|b_k^{2,2,2}| &\leq C \Delta t \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} dt (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p,2q)}})^{K+1} \Delta t \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} (|A S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell+1}|_{\mathcal{L}(L^q)} + |A S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell+1} B|_{\mathcal{L}(L^q)}) \\
&\leq C \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-2\kappa} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} dt (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p,2q)}})^{K+1} \left(\Delta t \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} \frac{1}{t_{k-\ell}^{1-\kappa}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to treat $b_k^{2,2,3}$. Writing

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} A S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell+1} \sigma(X_\ell) \Delta W_\ell = \int_0^{t_k} A S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_r}) dW(r)$$

as a stochastic integral, and subdividing the interval $[0, t_k] = [0, t_{k-1}] \cup [t_{k-1}, t_k]$, we have the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}
b_k^{2,2,3} &= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \langle Du(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)), DG(\tilde{X}(s)) \cdot \left(\int_0^{t_k} AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_r}) dW(r) \right) \rangle ds dt \\
&= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \langle Du(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)), DG(\tilde{X}(s)) \cdot \left(\int_0^{t_{k-1}} AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_r}) dW(r) \right) \rangle ds dt \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \langle Du(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)), DG(\tilde{X}(s)) \cdot \left(\int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_r}) dW(r) \right) \rangle ds dt \\
&= b_k^{2,2,3,1} + b_k^{2,2,3,2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using Malliavin's integration by parts formula,

$$\begin{aligned}
b_k^{2,2,3,1} &= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \langle Du(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)), DG(\tilde{X}(s)) \cdot \left(\int_0^{t_{k-1}} AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_r}) dW(r) \right) \rangle ds dt \\
&= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \sum_n \langle Du(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)), DG(\tilde{X}(s)) \cdot \left(\int_0^{t_{k-1}} AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_r}) e_n d\beta_n(r) \right) \rangle ds dt \\
&= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \sum_{n,m} \langle Du(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)), DG(\tilde{X}(s)) \cdot e_m \rangle \int_0^{t_{k-1}} \langle AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_r}) e_n, e_m \rangle d\beta_n(r) ds dt \\
&= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \int_0^{t_{k-1}} \sum_{n,m} \langle AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_r}) e_n, e_m \rangle D^2 u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \cdot (\mathcal{D}_r \tilde{X}(t) e_n, DG(\tilde{X}(s)) \cdot e_m) dr ds dt \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \int_0^{t_{k-1}} \sum_{n,m} \langle AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_r}) e_n, e_m \rangle \langle Du(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)), D^2 G(\tilde{X}(s)) \cdot (e_m, \mathcal{D}_r \tilde{X}(s) e_n) \rangle dr ds dt \\
&= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \int_0^{t_{k-1}} \sum_n D^2 u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \cdot (U(t, r) S_{\Delta t} e_n, DG(\tilde{X}(s)) AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_r})^2 e_n) dr dt ds \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \int_0^{t_{k-1}} \sum_n \langle Du(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)), D^2 G(\tilde{X}(s)) \cdot (AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_r})^2 e_n, U(s, r) S_{\Delta t} e_n) \rangle dr ds dt,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the identities $\mathcal{D}_r \tilde{X}(t) = U(t, r) S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_{\ell_r})$ and $\mathcal{D}_r \tilde{X}(s) = U(s, r) S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_{\ell_r})$ for $r < t_{k-1} \leq s \leq t \leq t_k$.

To estimate $b_k^{2,2,3,1}$ we first write

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} DG(\tilde{X}(s)) AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_r})^2 e_n|_{L^{4q}}^2 &\leq c \mathbb{E} |F'_1(\tilde{X}(s)) AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_r})^2 e_n|_{L^{4q}}^2 \\
&\quad + c \mathbb{E} |(-A)^{2\kappa} F'_2(\tilde{X}(s)) AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_r})^2 e_n|_{L^{4q}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The treatment of the first term is straightforward, with upper bound given by $c |AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1}|_{\mathcal{L}(L^{4q})}$. For the second term, we use (9) and (11):

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} |(-A)^{2\kappa} F'_2(\tilde{X}(s)) AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_r})^2 e_n|_{L^{4q}}^2 &\leq c \mathbb{E} \left(1 + |(-A)^{3\kappa} \tilde{X}(s)|_{L^{8q}} |(-A)^{1+3\kappa} S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_r})^2 e_n|_{L^{8q}} \right)^2 \\
&\leq c \mathbb{E} \left((1 + |(-A)^{3\kappa} \tilde{X}(s)|_{L^{8q}}) |(-A)^{1+3\kappa} S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1}|_{\mathcal{L}(L^{8q})} \right)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using (64), we obtain:

$$\left(\mathbb{E} |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} DG(\tilde{X}(s)) AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_r})^2 e_n|_{L^{4q}}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq c \left(1 + \frac{1}{t_k^{3\kappa}} |x|_{L^{8q}} \Delta t^{-4\kappa} \frac{1}{t_{k-\ell_r}^{1-\kappa}} \right).$$

Moreover by Lemma 5.1:

$$\left(\mathbb{E} |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} U(t, r) S_{\Delta t} e_n|_{L^{4q}}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq c \left(|(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} S_{\Delta t} e_n|_{L^{4q}} + \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa} |S_{\Delta t} e_n|_{L^{4q}} \right),$$

and using Theorem 3.3 we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathbb{E} D^2 u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \cdot (U(t, r) S_{\Delta t} e_n, DG(\tilde{X}(s)) AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_r})^2 e_n) \right| \\
& \leq c(1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-2\kappa}} (1 + t_k^{-3\kappa} |x|_{L^{8q}}) \Delta t^{-4\kappa} \frac{1}{t_{k-\ell_r}^{1-\kappa}} \\
& \quad \times (|(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} S_{\Delta t} e_n|_{L^{4q}} + \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa} |S_{\Delta t} e_n|_{L^{4q}}) \\
& \leq c(1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-2\kappa}} (1 + t_k^{-3\kappa} |x|_{L^{8q}}) \Delta t^{-6\kappa} \frac{1}{t_{k-\ell_r}^{1-\kappa}} \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The second term of $b_k^{2,2,3,1}$ is treated similarly thanks to Theorem 3.2 (with $\beta = \frac{1}{2} + \kappa$):

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathbb{E} \langle Du(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)), D^2 G(\tilde{X}(s)) \cdot (AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_r})^2 e_n, U(s, r) S_{\Delta t} e_n) \rangle \right| \\
& \leq c(1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} \mathbb{E} |(AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r} \sigma(X_{\ell_r})^2 e_n)(U(s, r) S_{\Delta t} e_n)|_{L^q} \\
& \leq c(1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} |AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r}|_{\mathcal{L}(L^{2q})} \mathbb{E} |U(s, r) S_{\Delta t} e_n|_{L^{2q}} \\
& \leq c(1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} \Delta t^{-\kappa} \frac{1}{t_{k-\ell_r}^{1-\kappa}} |S_{\Delta t} e_n|_{L^{2q}} \\
& \leq c(1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} \Delta t^{-\frac{1}{2}-2\kappa} \frac{1}{t_{k-\ell_r}^{1-\kappa}} \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}}.
\end{aligned}$$

We deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
|b_k^{2,2,3,1}| & \leq C(1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 8q)}})^{K+2} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \int_0^{t_{k-1}} \sum_n \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-2\kappa}} (1 + t_k^{-3\kappa} |x|_{L^{8q}}) \Delta t^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa} \frac{1}{t_{k-\ell_r}^{1-\kappa}} \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} dr ds dt \\
& \leq C \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-4\kappa} (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 8q)}})^{K+3} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{t^{3\kappa}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-\kappa}} \left(\Delta t \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} \frac{1}{t_{k-\ell}^{1-\kappa}} \right) \left(\sum_n \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} \right) dt \\
& \leq C \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-4\kappa} (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 8q)}})^{K+3} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{t^{3\kappa}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-\kappa}} dt,
\end{aligned}$$

using similar arguments to the control of $a_k^{1,3}$.

To treat the remaining term $b_k^{2,2,3,2}$, we again use Mallavin's integration by parts formula. With the same arguments as for $b_k^{2,2,3,1}$, we get the identity

$$\begin{aligned}
b_k^{2,2,3,2} & = \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \langle Du(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)), DG(\tilde{X}(s)) \cdot \left(\int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} AS_{\Delta t}^2 \sigma(X_{k-1}) dW(r) \right) \rangle ds dt \\
& = \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \sum_n D^2 u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \cdot (U(t, r) S_{\Delta t} e_n, DG(\tilde{X}(s)) AS_{\Delta t}^2 \sigma(X_{k-1})^2 e_n) dr dt ds \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \sum_n \langle Du(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)), D^2 G(\tilde{X}(s)) \cdot (AS_{\Delta t}^2 \sigma(X_{k-1})^2 e_n, U(s, r) S_{\Delta t} e_n) \rangle dr ds dt,
\end{aligned}$$

and we get, using Theorems 3.2 and 3.3, and Lemma 5.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
|b_k^{2,2,3,2}| & \leq C \Delta t^2 (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-\kappa}} dt \\
& \quad \sum_n \left(|(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} S_{\Delta t} e_n|_{L^{4q}} + \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa} |S_{\Delta t} e_n|_{L^{4q}} \right) |(-A)^{1+\kappa} S_{\Delta t}^2|_{\mathcal{L}(L^{4q})} \\
& \leq C \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-3\kappa} (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-\kappa}} dt \sum_n \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Control of $b_k^{2,3}$. The treatment of this term is straightforward, using Theorem 3.2, with $\beta = \frac{1}{2} + \kappa$, and Property 2.2. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
|b_k^{2,3}| &= \left| \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \sum_i \partial_i u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \langle S_{\Delta t} G(X_k), DG_i(\tilde{X}(s)) \rangle ds dt \right| \\
&= \left| \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \langle Du(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)), DG(\tilde{X}(s)) \cdot (S_{\Delta t} G(X_k)) \rangle ds dt \right| \\
&\leq C(1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} \int_{t_k}^t (\mathbb{E} |(-A)^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} S_{\Delta t} (-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa} G(X_k)|_{L^q}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} ds dt \\
&\leq C \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa} (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} dt,
\end{aligned}$$

using $|S_{\Delta t} B|_{\mathcal{L}(L^q)} \leq C \Delta t^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$ thanks to (13) and Lemma 4.2.

Control of $b_k^{2,4}$. The term $b_k^{2,4}$ involves a stochastic integral. Similarly to the treatment of the term $a_k^{3,2}$, we use Malliavin's integration by parts formula, and the identity $\mathcal{D}_s \tilde{X}(t) = S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k)$ for $t_k \leq s < t \leq t_{k+1}$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|b_k^{2,4}| &= \left| \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \sum_i \partial_i u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \left\langle \int_{t_k}^t \langle DG_i(\tilde{X}(s)), S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k) dW(s) \rangle dt \right| \right| \\
&= \left| \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \text{Tr} \left((\mathcal{D}_s \tilde{X}(t))^* D^2 u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) DG(\tilde{X}(s)) S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k) \right) ds dt \right| \\
&= \left| \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \sum_n D^2 u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \cdot (S_{\Delta t} e_n, DG(\tilde{X}(s)) S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k)^2 e_n) ds dt \right| \\
&\leq C(1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \sum_n \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-2\kappa}} |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} S_{\Delta t} e_n|_{L^{4q}} \\
&\quad \left(\mathbb{E} |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} DG(\tilde{X}(s)) S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k)^2 e_n|_{L^{4q}}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} ds dt \\
&\leq C \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-4\kappa} \sum_n \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t_k^{3\kappa}} |x|_{L^{8q}} \right) \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-2\kappa}} dt \\
&\leq C \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-4\kappa} \sum_n \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 8q)}})^{K+2} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{3\kappa}} \right) \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-2\kappa}} dt,
\end{aligned}$$

thanks to similar arguments as for the treatment of $b_k^{2,2,3}$.

Conclusion. Gathering the estimates on $b_k^{2,1}$, $b_k^{2,2}$, $b_k^{2,3}$ and $b_k^{2,4}$, and summing for $k \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$, we obtain

$$(74) \quad \sum_{k=1}^N |b_k^2| \leq C \Delta^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa} (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 8q)}})^{K+2} \int_0^T \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{3\kappa}} \right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-\kappa}} \right) dt.$$

5.4. Control of c_k .

5.4.1. *Decompositions.* For each $k \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$, c_k is decomposed into the following terms:

$$(75) \quad c_k = c_k^1 + c_k^2 + c_k^3 = c_k^1 + c_k^2 + (c_k^{3,\mathcal{A}} + c_k^{3,\mathcal{B}} + c_k^{3,\mathcal{C}} + c_k^{3,\mathcal{D}}),$$

where (using the symmetry of D^2u)

$$\begin{aligned} c_k^1 &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \text{Tr} \left((I - S_{\Delta t}) \sigma(\tilde{X}(t))^2 (I - S_{\Delta t}) D^2u(T - t, \tilde{X}(t)) \right) dt, \\ c_k^2 &= \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \text{Tr} \left(S_{\Delta t} \sigma(\tilde{X}(t))^2 (I - S_{\Delta t}) D^2u(T - t, \tilde{X}(t)) \right) dt, \\ c_k^3 &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \text{Tr} \left(S_{\Delta t} [\sigma(\tilde{X}(t))^2 - \sigma(X_k)^2] S_{\Delta t} D^2u(T - t, \tilde{X}(t)) \right) dt. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, c_k^3 is further decomposed as follows: for $\Lambda \in \{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} (76) \quad c_k^{3,\Lambda} &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \text{Tr} \left(S_{\Delta t} \Lambda S_{\Delta t} D^2u(T - t, \tilde{X}(t)) \right) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \sum_n D^2u(T - t, \tilde{X}(t)) \cdot (S_{\Delta t} \Lambda e_n, S_{\Delta t} e_n) dt, \end{aligned}$$

with the linear operators $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}$ obtained by applying Itô's formula:

$$\langle [\sigma(\tilde{X}(t))^2 - \sigma(X_k)^2] h_1, h_2 \rangle = \sum_{\Lambda \in \{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}\}} \langle \Lambda h_1, h_2 \rangle,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{A} h_1, h_2 \rangle &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_k}^t \text{Tr} \left(S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k)^2 S_{\Delta t} D^2 \sigma_{h_1, h_2}^2(\tilde{X}(s)) \right) ds \\ \langle \mathcal{B} h_1, h_2 \rangle &= \int_{t_k}^t \langle S_{\Delta t} A X_k, D \sigma_{h_1, h_2}^2(\tilde{X}(s)) \rangle ds \\ \langle \mathcal{C} h_1, h_2 \rangle &= \int_{t_k}^t \langle S_{\Delta t} G(X_k), D \sigma_{h_1, h_2}^2(\tilde{X}(s)) \rangle ds \\ \langle \mathcal{D} h_1, h_2 \rangle &= \int_{t_k}^t \langle D \sigma_{h_1, h_2}^2(\tilde{X}(s)), S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k) dW(s) \rangle ds, \end{aligned}$$

using the notation $\sigma_{h_1, h_2}^2 = \langle \sigma(\cdot)^2 h_1, h_2 \rangle$.

For future reference, note the following identity:

$$(77) \quad \langle D \sigma_{e_n, e_m}^2(x), h \rangle = \int_{(0,1)} (\sigma^2)'(x(\xi)) e_n(\xi) e_m(\xi) h(\xi) d\xi = \langle D \sigma_{e_n, h}^2(x), e_m \rangle.$$

5.4.2. *Treatment of c_k^1 .* Since Theorem 3.3 is restricted to $\beta, \gamma < \frac{1}{2}$, this term needs some work:

$$\begin{aligned} |c_k^1| &= \frac{1}{2} \left| \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \text{Tr} \left((I - S_{\Delta t}) D^2u(T - t, \tilde{X}(t)) (I - S_{\Delta t}) \sigma(\tilde{X}(t))^2 \right) dt \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \sum_n \left| D^2u(T - t, \tilde{X}(t)) \cdot ((I - S_{\Delta t}) e_n, (I - S_{\Delta t}) \sigma(\tilde{X}(t))^2 e_n) \right| dt \\ &\leq C(1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \sum_n \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T - t)^{1-2\kappa}} |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}\kappa} (I - S_{\Delta t}) e_n|_{L^{4q}} \\ &\quad \left(\mathbb{E} |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} (I - S_{\Delta t}) \sigma(\tilde{X}(t))^2 e_n|_{L^{4q}}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dt \\ &\leq C(1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-4\kappa} \sum_n \lambda_n^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T - t)^{1-2\kappa}} \left(\mathbb{E} |(-A)^{-3\kappa} \sigma(\tilde{X}(t))^2 e_n|_{L^{4q}}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Using (9), (12), we get

$$|(-A)^{-2\kappa} \sigma(\tilde{X}(t))^2 e_n|_{L^{4q}} \leq C |(-A)^{-2\kappa} e_n|_{L^{8q}} |(-A)^{4\kappa} \sigma(\tilde{X}(t))^2|_{L^{8q}} \leq C \lambda_n^{-2\kappa} (1 + |(-A)^{5\kappa} \tilde{X}(t)|_{L^{8q}}).$$

As a consequence, using (64),

$$|c_k^1| \leq C(1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 8q)}})^{K+2} \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-5\kappa} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{5\kappa}}\right) \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-\kappa}} dt.$$

5.4.3. *Treatment of c_k^2 .* The treatment of c_k^2 is straightforward, using Theorem 3.3:

$$\begin{aligned} |c_k^2| &\leq \left| \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \sum_n D^2 u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \cdot (S_{\Delta t} e_n, (I - S_{\Delta t}) \sigma(\tilde{X}(t))) dt \right| \\ &\leq C(1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-2\kappa}} \sum_n |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} S_{\Delta t} e_n|_{L^{4q}} |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} (I - S_{\Delta t})|_{\mathcal{L}(L^{4q})} dt \\ &\leq C(1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-3\kappa} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-2\kappa}} dt \sum_n \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}}. \end{aligned}$$

5.4.4. *Treatment of c_k^3 .*

Control of $c_k^{3,\mathcal{A}}$. We proceed similarly, and applying Theorem 3.3 we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} |c_k^{3,\mathcal{A}}| &\leq C(1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-2\kappa}} \sum_n |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} S_{\Delta t} e_n|_{L^{4q}} \left(\mathbb{E} |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} S_{\Delta t} \mathcal{A} e_n|_{L^{4q}}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dt \\ &\leq C \Delta t^{-2\kappa} C(1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-2\kappa}} dt \sum_n \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} \left(\mathbb{E} |\mathcal{A} e_n|_{L^{4q}}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

To have a control on $(\mathbb{E} |\mathcal{A} e_n|_{L^{4q}}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, let any $h_1 \in L^{4q}$ and $h_2 \in L^r$, with $\frac{1}{4q} + \frac{1}{r} = 1$; then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{A} h_1, h_2 \rangle &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_k}^t \text{Tr} \left(S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k)^2 S_{\Delta t} D^2 \sigma_{h_1, h_2}^2(\tilde{X}(s)) \right) ds \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \sum_n D^2 \sigma_{h_1, h_2}^2(\tilde{X}(s)) \cdot (S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k)^2 e_n, S_{\Delta t} e_n) ds \\ &\leq C \Delta t |h_1|_{L^{4q}} |h_2|_{L^r} \sum_n |S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k)^2 e_n|_{L^\infty} |S_{\Delta t} e_n|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq C \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa} |h_1|_{L^{4q}} |h_2|_{L^r} \sum_n \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $(\mathbb{E} |\mathcal{A} e_n|_{L^{4q}}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}$, and we obtain

$$|c_k^{3,\mathcal{A}}| \leq C \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-3\kappa} C(1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-2\kappa}} dt \sum_n \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}}.$$

Control of $c_k^{3,\mathcal{B}}$. Like $a_k^{1,3}$ and $b_k^{2,2}$, the term $c_k^{3,\mathcal{B}}$ contains a bad term and require a careful analysis. We introduce the decomposition $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_1 + \mathcal{B}_2 + \mathcal{B}_3$, and the associated terms c_k^{3,\mathcal{B}_1} , c_k^{3,\mathcal{B}_2} and c_k^{3,\mathcal{B}_3} , with

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{B}_1 h_1, h_2 \rangle &= \int_{t_k}^t \langle S_{\Delta t}^{k+1} A x, D \sigma_{h_1, h_2}^2(\tilde{X}(s)) \rangle ds \\ \langle \mathcal{B}_2 h_1, h_2 \rangle &= \int_{t_k}^t \left\langle \int_0^t S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} A G(X_{\ell_r}) dr, D \sigma_{h_1, h_2}^2(\tilde{X}(s)) \right\rangle ds \\ \langle \mathcal{B}_3 h_1, h_2 \rangle &= \int_{t_k}^t \left\langle \int_0^t A S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_r}) dW(r), D \sigma_{h_1, h_2}^2(\tilde{X}(s)) \right\rangle ds. \end{aligned}$$

The terms c_k^{3,\mathcal{B}_1} and c_k^{3,\mathcal{B}_2} do not present difficulties, using (77) and standard arguments. Indeed, for any $h_1 \in L^{4q}$ and $h_2 \in L^r$, with $\frac{1}{4q} + \frac{1}{r} = 1$,

$$\langle \mathcal{B}_1 h_1, h_2 \rangle \leq C \Delta t |h_1|_{L^{4q}} |h_2|_{L^r} |AS_{\Delta t}^{k+1} x|_{L^\infty} \leq C |x|_{L^p} \frac{\Delta t^{\frac{3}{4}-3\kappa}}{t_k^{1-\kappa}} |h_1|_{L^{4q}} |h_2|_{L^r},$$

using $|(-A)^\kappa S_{\Delta t} x|_{L^\infty} \leq |(-A)^\kappa S_{\Delta t} x|_{W^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\kappa}{2}}} \leq C |(-A)^{\frac{1}{4}+2\kappa} S_{\Delta t} x|_{L^2} \leq \frac{C}{\Delta t^{\frac{1}{4}+2\kappa}} |x|_{L^p}$.

Similarly, we have for \mathcal{B}_2

$$\langle \mathcal{B}_2 h_1, h_2 \rangle \leq C \Delta t |h_1|_{L^{4q}} |h_2|_{L^r} \int_0^{t_k} |S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} AG(X_{\ell_r})|_{L^\infty} dr.$$

Moreover, using Property 2.2 and $G = F_1 + BF_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} |S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} AG(X_{\ell_r})|_{L^\infty} &\leq |(-A)^{\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa} S_{\Delta t}|_{\mathcal{L}(L^{\frac{1}{\kappa}}, L^\infty)} |(-A)^{1-\kappa} S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r}|_{\mathcal{L}(L^{\frac{1}{\kappa}})} \left(1 + |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\kappa} B|_{\mathcal{L}(L^{\frac{1}{\kappa}})}\right) \\ &\leq C |(-A)^{\frac{1}{2}+4\kappa} S_{\Delta t}|_{\mathcal{L}(L^{\frac{1}{\kappa}})} \\ &\leq \Delta t^{-\frac{1}{2}-4\kappa} t_{k-\ell_r}^{-1+\kappa}, \end{aligned}$$

using (13), as well as the following inequalities, which are consequences of Sobolev inequalities and of (8): for any $x \in L^{\frac{1}{\kappa}}$,

$$|(-A)^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} S_{\Delta t} x|_{L^\infty} \leq C |(-A)^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} S_{\Delta t} x|_{W^{2\kappa, \frac{1}{\kappa}}} \leq C |(-A)^{\frac{1}{2}+4\kappa} S_{\Delta t} x|_{L^{\frac{1}{\kappa}}}.$$

We thus obtain

$$|c_k^{3,\mathcal{B}_1}| + |c_k^{3,\mathcal{B}_2}| \leq C(1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-5\kappa} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{1-\kappa}}\right) \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-2\kappa}} dt \sum_n \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}}.$$

Finally, $c_k^{\mathcal{B}_3}$ requires a Malliavin integration. First, we write

$$\begin{aligned} c_k^{3,\mathcal{B}_3} &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \sum_n D^2 u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \cdot (S_{\Delta t} \mathcal{B}_3 e_n, S_{\Delta t} e_n) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \sum_{n,m} \langle \mathcal{B}_3 e_n, e_m \rangle D^2 u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \cdot (S_{\Delta t} e_m, S_{\Delta t} e_n) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \iiint \sum_{n,m,j} \langle AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_r}) e_j, D\sigma_{e_n, e_m}^2(\tilde{X}(s)) \rangle D^2 u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \cdot (S_{\Delta t} e_m, S_{\Delta t} e_n) d\beta_j(r) ds dt, \end{aligned}$$

where for simplicity we use the notation $\iiint (\dots) d\beta_n(r) ds dt = \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \int_0^t (\dots) d\beta_n(r) ds dt$.

Using Malliavin's integration by parts, for $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$ and $s \in [t_k, t]$, then

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m,j} \int_0^{t_k} \langle AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_r}) e_j, D\sigma_{e_n, e_m}^2(\tilde{X}(s)) \rangle D^2 u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \cdot (S_{\Delta t} e_m, S_{\Delta t} e_n) d\beta_j(r) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m,j} \int_0^{t_k} D^2 \sigma_{e_n, e_m}(\tilde{X}(s)) \cdot (AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_r}) e_j, \mathcal{D}_r \tilde{X}(s) e_j) D^2 u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \cdot (S_{\Delta t} e_m, S_{\Delta t} e_n) dr \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m,j} \int_0^{t_k} \langle AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} \sigma(X_{\ell_r}) e_j, D\sigma_{e_n, e_m}^2(\tilde{X}(s)) \rangle D^3 u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \cdot (S_{\Delta t} e_m, S_{\Delta t} e_n, \mathcal{D}_r \tilde{X}(t) e_j) dr \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m,j} \int_0^{t_k} D^2 \sigma_{e_n, e_m}(\tilde{X}(s)) \cdot (AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} e_j, \mathcal{D}_r \tilde{X}(s) \sigma(X_{\ell_r}) e_j) D^2 u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \cdot (S_{\Delta t} e_m, S_{\Delta t} e_n) dr \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_j \int_0^{t_k} D^3 u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \cdot (S_{\Delta t} e_n, S_{\Delta t} D\sigma_{e_n, AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} e_j}^2(\tilde{X}(s)), \mathcal{D}_r \tilde{X}(t) \sigma(X_{\ell_r}) e_j) dr \right], \end{aligned}$$

using the identity $\sigma(\cdot)^* = \sigma(\cdot)$ for both lines, and (77) for the second line. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| D^2 \sigma_{e_n, e_m}(\tilde{X}(s)) \cdot (AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} e_j, \mathcal{D}_r \tilde{X}(s) \sigma(X_{\ell_r}) e_j) \right| &\leq C |e_n|_{L^\infty} |e_m|_{L^\infty} |AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r} e_j|_{L^2} |\mathcal{D}_r \tilde{X}(s) \sigma(X_{\ell_r}) e_j|_{L^2} \\ \left| D \sigma_{e_n, AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} e_j}^2(\tilde{X}(s)) \right|_{L^{4q}} &\leq C |e_n|_{L^\infty} |AS_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell_r+1} e_j|_{L^\infty}, \end{aligned}$$

and using Lemma 5.1 we get

$$E |\mathcal{D}_r \tilde{X}(s) \sigma(X_{\ell_r}) e_j|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \mathbb{E} |\sigma(X_{\ell_r}) e_j|_{L^2} \leq C.$$

Then, using Theorem 3.3 and Proposition 3.5, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |c_k^{3, \mathcal{B}_3}| &\leq C(1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \int_0^t \frac{\Delta t^{-\frac{1}{2}-6\kappa}}{t_{k-\ell_r}^{1-\kappa}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-2\kappa}} dr ds dt \\ &\quad + C(1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \int_0^t \frac{\Delta t^{-\frac{1}{2}-4\kappa}}{t_{k-\ell_r}^{1-\kappa}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} dr ds dt \\ &\leq C \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-6\kappa} (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-2\kappa}} dt \\ &\quad + C \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-6\kappa} (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Control of $c_k^{3, \mathcal{C}}$. Using (76), similarly to $c_k^{3, \mathcal{A}}$, we get

$$|c_k^{3, \mathcal{C}}| \leq C \Delta t^{-2\kappa} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-2\kappa}} dt \sum_n \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} (\mathbb{E} |\mathcal{C} e_n|_{L^{4q}}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

For any $h_1 \in L^{4q}$ and $h_2 \in L^r$, with $\frac{1}{4q} + \frac{1}{r} = 1$, we get

$$|\langle \mathcal{C} h_1, h_2 \rangle| \leq C \Delta t |h_1|_{L^{4q}} |h_2|_{L^r} |S_{\Delta t} G(X_k)|_{L^\infty} \leq C \Delta t^{-1/2-\kappa} |h_1|_{L^{4q}} |h_2|_{L^r}.$$

We thus obtain

$$|c_k^{3, \mathcal{C}}| \leq C \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-2\kappa} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-2\kappa}} dt \sum_n \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}}.$$

Control of $c_k^{3, \mathcal{D}}$. Using (76), the definition of \mathcal{D} , and Malliavin integration by parts formula,

$$\begin{aligned} c_k^{3, \mathcal{D}} &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \sum_{n, m} \langle \mathcal{D} e_n, e_m \rangle D^2 u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \cdot (S_{\Delta t} e_m, S_{\Delta t} e_n) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \sum_{j, n, m} \langle D \sigma_{e_n, e_m}^2(\tilde{X}(s)), S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k) e_j \rangle d\beta_j(s) D^2 u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \cdot (S_{\Delta t} e_m, S_{\Delta t} e_n) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \sum_{j, n, m} D^3 u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \cdot (\mathcal{D}_s \tilde{X}(t) e_j, S_{\Delta t} e_m, S_{\Delta t} e_n) \langle D \sigma_{e_n, e_m}^2(\tilde{X}(s)), S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k) e_j \rangle ds dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \sum_{j, n, m} D^3 u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \cdot (S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k) e_j, S_{\Delta t} e_m, S_{\Delta t} e_n) \langle D \sigma_{e_n, e_m}^2(\tilde{X}(s)), S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k) e_j \rangle ds dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \sum_{j, n} D^3 u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \cdot (S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k) e_j, S_{\Delta t} D \sigma_{e_n, S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k) e_j}^2(\tilde{X}(s)), S_{\Delta t} e_n) ds dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \sum_{j, n} D^3 u(T-t, \tilde{X}(t)) \cdot (S_{\Delta t} e_j, S_{\Delta t} D \sigma_{e_n, S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k)^2 e_j}^2(\tilde{X}(s)), S_{\Delta t} e_n) ds dt, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (77), and then (18).

We now use Proposition 3.5. Note that

$$|\langle D \sigma_{e_n, S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_k)^2 e_j}^2(\tilde{X}(s)), h \rangle| \leq C |h|_{L^r} |e_n|_{L^{4q}} |e_j|_{L^\infty} \leq C |h|_{L^r},$$

for any $h \in L^r$, with $\frac{1}{4q} + \frac{1}{r} = 1$; thus $(\mathbb{E}|D\sigma_{e_n, S_{\Delta t}\sigma(X_k)^2 e_j}(\tilde{X}(s))|_{L^{4q}}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C$.

We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |c_k^{3,\mathcal{D}}| &\leq C(1 + |x|_{L^p})^K \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^t \frac{1}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} \sum_{j,n} |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} S_{\Delta t} e_j|_{L^{4q}} |S_{\Delta t} e_n|_{L^{4q}} ds dt \\ &\leq C\Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-3\kappa} (1 + |x|_{L^p})^K \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} dt \sum_n \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}} \sum_j \frac{1}{\lambda_j^{\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}}. \end{aligned}$$

Conclusion. Gathering the estimates on $c_k^{3,\mathcal{A}}$, $c_k^{3,\mathcal{B}}$, $c_k^{3,\mathcal{C}}$ and $c_k^{3,\mathcal{D}}$, and summing for $k \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$, we obtain

$$(78) \quad \sum_{k=1}^N |c_k^3| \leq C\Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa} (1 + |x|_{L^{\max(p, 2q)}})^{K+1} \int_0^T \left(1 + \frac{1}{(T-t)^{1-\kappa}}\right) dt.$$

5.5. An auxiliary result. We used the estimate below for the treatment of several terms, for instance $a_k^{1,3}$ and $b_k^{2,2,3,1}$. Recall that $\mathcal{D}_s \tilde{X}(t) = U(t, s) S_{\Delta t} \sigma(X_\ell)$ for $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1})$, $s \in [t_\ell, t_{\ell+1})$, and $\ell \leq k-1$.

Lemma 5.1. *For every $q \in [2, \infty)$, $T \in (0, \infty)$ and $\kappa > 0$ sufficiently small, there exists $C_{q,\kappa}(T)$ such that for every $h \in L^q$, $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1})$, $s \in [t_\ell, t_{\ell+1})$, with $1 \leq k \leq N$,*

$$(79) \quad (\mathbb{E}|(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} U(t, s) h|_{L^q}^{2K})^{\frac{1}{2K}} \leq C_{q,\kappa}(T) \left(|(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} h|_{L^q} + \Delta t^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa} |h|_{L^q} \right) \quad \text{if } k > \ell + 1.$$

Proof of Lemma 5.1. Let s be fixed. It can be seen that $U_t = U(t, s)h$ satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} U_t &= U_{t_k} + \int_{t_k}^t (AS_{\Delta t} U_{t_k} + S_{\Delta t} G'(X_k) \cdot U_{t_k}) dr + \int_{t_k}^t S_{\Delta t} (\sigma'(X_k) \cdot U_{t_k}) dW(r), \\ U_{t_{k+1}} &= S_{\Delta t} U_{t_k} + \Delta t S_{\Delta t} G'(X_k) \cdot U_{t_k} + S_{\Delta t} (\sigma'(X_k) \cdot U_{t_k}) \Delta W_k, \\ U_{t_{\ell+1}} &= h. \end{aligned}$$

First, for every $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} U_t|_{L^q}^2 &\leq C\mathbb{E}|(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} U_{t_k}|_{L^q}^2 + C\Delta t^2 |AS_{\Delta t}|_{\mathcal{L}(L^q)}^2 \mathbb{E}|(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} U_{t_k}|_{L^q}^2 \\ &\quad + C\Delta t^{1-2\kappa} \mathbb{E}|U_{t_k}|_{L^q}^2 + C\Delta t \mathbb{E}|(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} S_{\Delta t} (\sigma'(X_k) \cdot U_{t_k})|_{R(L^2, L^q)}^2 \\ &\leq C\mathbb{E}|(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} U_{t_k}|_{L^q}^2 + C\Delta t^{1-2\kappa} \mathbb{E}|U_{t_k}|_{L^q}^2 + C\Delta t |(-A)^{\frac{1}{2q}-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}|_{R(L^2, L^q)}^2 \mathbb{E}|U_{t_k}|_{L^q}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $|(-A)^{\frac{1}{2q}-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}|_{R(L^2, L^q)}^2 < \infty$ when $\frac{1}{2q} - \frac{1}{2} + \kappa < -\frac{1}{4}$; this condition is satisfied when $q > 2$ and $\kappa > 0$ is chosen sufficiently small.

The result is clear for $k = \ell + 1$. For $k > \ell + 1$, since $U_{t_k} = \Pi_{k-1:\ell+1} h$, we get, by Lemma 4.4,

$$\Delta t^{1-2\kappa} \mathbb{E}|U_{t_k}|_{L^q}^2 \leq \frac{C\Delta t^{1-2\kappa}}{(k-\ell-1)^{1-2\kappa} \Delta t^{1-2\kappa}} |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} h|_{L^q}^2 \leq C|(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa} h|_{L^q}^2.$$

Now,

$$U_{t_k} = S_{\Delta t}^{k-\ell-1} h + \Delta t \sum_{m=\ell+1}^{k-1} S_{\Delta t}^{k-m} B F'(X_m) \cdot U_{t_m} + \sum_{m=\ell+1}^{k-1} S_{\Delta t}^{k-m} (\sigma'(X_m) \cdot U_{t_m}) \Delta W_m,$$

and thus, with the condition $\frac{1}{2q} - \frac{1}{2} + \kappa < -\frac{1}{4}$ fulfilled for $\kappa > 0$ sufficiently small,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}U_{t_k}|_{L^{2q}}^2 &\leq |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}h|_{L^q}^2 + C \left(\Delta t \sum_{m=\ell+1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{t_{k-m}^{2\kappa}} \mathbb{E}|U_{t_m}|_{L^q} \right)^2 + C \Delta t \sum_{m=\ell+1}^{k-1} \mathbb{E}|U_{t_m}|_{L^q}^2 \\ &\leq |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa}h|_{L^q}^2 + C \Delta t^2 \frac{1}{t_{k-\ell-1}^{4\kappa}} |h|_{L^q}^2 + C \Delta t |h|_{L^q}^2 \\ &\quad + C \left(\left(\Delta t \sum_{m=\ell+2}^{k-1} \frac{1}{t_{k-m}^{2\kappa}} \frac{1}{t_{m-\ell-1}^{\frac{1}{2}-\kappa}} \right)^2 + \Delta t \sum_{m=\ell+2}^{k-1} \frac{1}{t_{m-\ell-1}^{1-2\kappa}} \right) |(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}h|_{L^q}^2 \\ &\leq C|(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}+2\kappa}h|_{L^q}^2 + C \Delta t |h|_{L^q}^2. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of Lemma 5.1. □

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Alòs, D. Nualart, and F. Viens. Stochastic heat equation with white-noise drift. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, 36(2):181–218, 2000.
- [2] A. Andersson, M. Hefter, A. Jentzen, and R. Kurniawan. Regularity properties for solutions of infinite dimensional kolmogorov equations in hilbert spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.00858*, 2016.
- [3] A. Andersson, R. Kruse, and S. Larsson. Duality in refined Sobolev-Malliavin spaces and weak approximation of SPDE. *Stoch. Partial Differ. Equ. Anal. Comput.*, 4(1):113–149, 2016.
- [4] A. Andersson and S. Larsson. Weak convergence for a spatial approximation of the nonlinear stochastic heat equation. *Math. Comp.*, 85(299):1335–1358, 2016.
- [5] C.-E. Bréhier. Approximation of the invariant measure with an Euler scheme for stochastic PDEs driven by space-time white noise. *Potential Anal.*, 40(1):1–40, 2014.
- [6] C.-E. Bréhier and M. Kopec. Approximation of the invariant law of spdes: error analysis using a poisson equation for a full-discretization scheme. *arXiv:1311.7030*, 2013.
- [7] Z. Brzeźniak. On stochastic convolution in Banach spaces and applications. *Stochastics Stochastics Rep.*, 61(3-4):245–295, 1997.
- [8] S. Cerrai. *Second order PDE's in finite and infinite dimension*, volume 1762 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. A probabilistic approach.
- [9] D. Conus, A. Jentzen, and R. Kurniawan. Weak convergence rates of spectral galerkin approximations for spdes with nonlinear diffusion coefficients. *arxiv:1408.1108*, 2014.
- [10] S. Cox, A. Jentzen, R. Kurniawan, and P. Pušnik. On the mild itô formula in banach spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.03210*, 2016.
- [11] G. Da Prato. *Kolmogorov equations for stochastic PDEs*. Advanced Courses in Mathematics. CRM Barcelona. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2004.
- [12] G. Da Prato. Kolmogorov equations for stochastic PDE's with multiplicative noise. In *Stochastic analysis and applications*, volume 2 of *Abel Symp.*, pages 235–263. Springer, Berlin, 2007.
- [13] G. Da Prato, A. Jentzen, and M. Röckner. A mild itô formula for spdes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1009.3526*, 2010.
- [14] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. *Stochastic equations in infinite dimensions*, volume 44 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992.
- [15] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. *Second Order Partial Differential Equations in Hilbert Spaces*, volume 293 of *Lecture Notes*. London Mathematical Society, 2002.
- [16] A. Debussche. Weak approximation of stochastic partial differential equations: the nonlinear case. *Math. Comp.*, 80(273):89–117, 2011.
- [17] A. Debussche and J. Printems. Weak order for the discretization of the stochastic heat equation. *Math. Comp.*, 78(266):845–863, 2009.
- [18] C. M. Elliott and S. Larsson. Error estimates with smooth and nonsmooth data for a finite element method for the Cahn-Hilliard equation. *Math. Comp.*, 58(198):603–630, S33–S36, 1992.
- [19] F. Flandoli, M. Gubinelli, and E. Priola. Well-posedness of the transport equation by stochastic perturbation. *Invent. Math.*, 180(1):1–53, 2010.
- [20] M. Geissert, M. Kovács, and S. Larsson. Rate of weak convergence of the finite element method for the stochastic heat equation with additive noise. *BIT*, 49(2):343–356, 2009.
- [21] I. C. Gohberg and M. G. a. Kreĭn. *Introduction to the theory of linear nonselfadjoint operators*. Translated from the Russian by A. Feinstein. Translations of Mathematical Monographs, Vol. 18. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1969.
- [22] M. Hairer, A. M. Stuart, and J. Voss. Analysis of SPDEs arising in path sampling. II. The nonlinear case. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 17(5-6):1657–1706, 2007.

- [23] E. Hausenblas. Weak approximation for semilinear stochastic evolution equations. In *Stochastic analysis and related topics VIII*, volume 53 of *Progr. Probab.*, pages 111–128. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2003.
- [24] M. Heffer, A. Jentzen, and R. Kurniawan. Weak convergence rates for numerical approximations of stochastic partial differential equations with nonlinear diffusion coefficients in umd banach spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.03209*, 2016.
- [25] L. Jacobe de Naurois, A. Jentzen, and T. Welti. Weak convergence rates for spatial spectral galerkin approximations of semilinear stochastic wave equations with multiplicative noise. *arxiv:1508.05168*, 2015.
- [26] A. Jentzen and R. Kurniawan. Weak convergence rates for euler-type approximations of semilinear stochastic evolution equations with nonlinear diffusion coefficients. *arxiv:1501.03539*, 2015.
- [27] P. E. Kloeden and E. Platen. Numerical solution of stochastic differential equations springer-verlag. *New York*, 1992.
- [28] M. Kovács, S. Larsson, and F. Lindgren. Weak convergence of finite element approximations of linear stochastic evolution equations with additive noise. *BIT*, 52(1):85–108, 2012.
- [29] M. Kovács, S. Larsson, and F. Lindgren. Weak convergence of finite element approximations of linear stochastic evolution equations with additive noise II. Fully discrete schemes. *BIT*, 53(2):497–525, 2013.
- [30] N. V. Krylov, M. Röckner, and J. Zabczyk. *Stochastic PDE's and Kolmogorov equations in infinite dimensions*, volume 1715 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin; Centro Internazionale Matematico Estivo (C.I.M.E.), Florence, 1999. Lectures given at the 2nd C.I.M.E. Session held in Cetraro, August 24–September 1, 1998, Edited by G. Da Prato, Fondazione C.I.M.E.. [C.I.M.E. Foundation].
- [31] J. A. León and D. Nualart. Stochastic evolution equations with random generators. *Ann. Probab.*, 26(1):149–186, 1998.
- [32] G. N. Milstein and M. V. Tretyakov. *Stochastic numerics for mathematical physics*. Scientific Computation. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004.
- [33] D. Nualart. *The Malliavin calculus and related topics*. Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 2006.
- [34] D. Nualart and É. Pardoux. Stochastic calculus with anticipating integrands. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 78(4):535–581, 1988.
- [35] D. Nualart and F. Viens. Evolution equation of a stochastic semigroup with white-noise drift. *Ann. Probab.*, 28(1):36–73, 2000.
- [36] É. Pardoux. Two-sided stochastic calculus for SPDEs. In *Stochastic partial differential equations and applications (Trento, 1985)*, volume 1236 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 200–207. Springer, Berlin, 1987.
- [37] É. Pardoux and P. Protter. A two-sided stochastic integral and its calculus. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 76(1):15–49, 1987.
- [38] A. Pazy. *Semigroups of linear operators and applications to partial differential equations*, volume 44 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983.
- [39] J. Printems. On the discretization in time of parabolic stochastic partial differential equations. *Monte Carlo Methods Appl.*, 7(3-4):359–368, 2001. Monte Carlo and probabilistic methods for partial differential equations, Part II (Monte Carlo, 2000).
- [40] M. Röckner and Z. Sobol. Kolmogorov equations in infinite dimensions: well-posedness and regularity of solutions, with applications to stochastic generalized Burgers equations. *Ann. Probab.*, 34(2):663–727, 2006.
- [41] D. W. Strook and S. R. Varadhan. *Multidimensional diffusion processes*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006.
- [42] D. Talay. Discrétisation d’une équation différentielle stochastique et calcul approché d’espérances de fonctionnelles de la solution. *RAIRO Modél. Math. Anal. Numér.*, 20(1):141–179, 1986.
- [43] A. Tambue and J. M. T. Ngnotchouye. Weak convergence for a stochastic exponential integrator and finite element discretization of stochastic partial differential equation with multiplicative & additive noise. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 108:57–86, 2016.
- [44] H. Triebel. *Interpolation theory, function spaces, differential operators*. Johann Ambrosius Barth, Heidelberg, second edition, 1995.
- [45] J. M. A. M. van Neerven, M. C. Veraar, and L. Weis. Stochastic integration in UMD Banach spaces. *Ann. Probab.*, 35(4):1438–1478, 2007.
- [46] J. M. A. M. van Neerven, M. C. Veraar, and L. Weis. Stochastic evolution equations in UMD Banach spaces. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 255(4):940–993, 2008.
- [47] X. Wang. Weak error estimates of the exponential Euler scheme for semi-linear SPDEs without Malliavin calculus. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 36(1):481–497, 2016.
- [48] X. Wang and S. Gan. Weak convergence analysis of the linear implicit Euler method for semilinear stochastic partial differential equations with additive noise. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 398(1):151–169, 2013.

UNIV LYON, UNIVERSITÉ CLAUDE BERNARD LYON 1, CNRS UMR 5208, INSTITUT CAMILLE JORDAN, 43 BLVD. DU 11 NOVEMBRE 1918, F-69622 VILLEURBANNE CEDEX, FRANCE
E-mail address: `brehier@math.univ-lyon1.fr`

IRMAR, ECOLE NORMALE SUPÉRIEURE DE RENNES, UBL, CNRS, CAMPUS DE KER LANN, 35170 BRUZ, FRANCE
E-mail address: `arnaud.debussche@ens-rennes.fr`